DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 292 183 EA 019 866

AUTHOR Lauber, Diana; And Others
TITLE 1986-1987 Assessment of School Site Budgeting Practice of the Chicago Public Schools.
INSTITUTION Chicago Panel on Public School Policy and Finance, IL.
PUB DATE 87
NOTE 65p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Accountability; Boards of Education; *Budgets; *Citizen Participation; *Compliance (Legal); Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; *Hearings; Participative Decision Making; Public Schools; School Based Management; *School Budget Elections; School Community Relationship; *School Funds; State Legislation; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS *Chicago Public Schools IL

ABSTRACT

The 1985 legislation (PA 84-126) creating Local School Improvement Councils (LSIC) and annual local school budget hearings laid the foundation for meaningful citizen involvement in the Chicago Public Schools. This legislation had two components: (1) annual school site budget hearings required in each school in which citizens, parents, and teachers vote on the proposed school budget for the following year; and (2) the creation of LSICs at each public school with specific rights and responsibilities over curriculum, personnel, and budget issues. The major finding of this second assessment is that the Chicago Board of Education has not adequately implemented either component of PA 84-126 and gives little indication that it has any intention of doing so in the future. The second budget hearings were a sham in 1986 and they were a sham in 1987. The administration continues to obstruct the LSICs' ability to function as intended by the legislation. The central recommendation of this assessment is that the Illinois Legislature must hold the board fully accountable to see that this legislation is implemented. Appendices constitute over half of the report and contain hearing results and survey forms. (MLF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G. Alfred Hess

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

THE CHICAGO PANEL ON PUBLIC SCHOOL POLICY AND FINANCE
220 S. State St., Suite 232
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 939-2202

Tee Gallay, President

American Jewish Committee
Aspira Inc., of Illinois
Center for Neighborhood Technology
Citizens Schools Committee
Chicago Region PTA
Chicago United
Chicago Urban League
Community Renewal Society
Erie Neighborhood House
Jewish Council on Urban Affairs
Junior League of Chicago, Inc.
Latino Institute
Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law
League of Women Voters of Chicago
Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund
United Neighborhood Organization of Chicago
The Woodlawn Organization
Youth Guidance

Support for this research has been provided by:

THE FIELD CORPORATION FUND AND THE WIEBOLDT FOUNDATION

Support for the Chicago Panel is also provided by:

Foundations:
Chicago Community Trust, Forest Fund, Fry Foundation
Joyce Foundation, MacArthur Foundation, Pick Fund
Spencer Foundation, W.P. and H.B. White Foundation
Woods Charitable Fund

Corporations:
Amoco, Borg Warner, Carson Pirie Scott, Fel-Pro, Kraft,
Northern Trust, Sears Roebuck andd Co., Chicago Tribune

Individual Contributors, Organization Dues, In-Kind Gifts

Staff of the Chicago Panel:

G. Alfred Hess, Jr., Executive Director
Diana Lauber, Assistant Director
Carmen Vazquez, Program Coordinator
Claudia Ingram, Program Consultant
Chris Warden, Research Assistant
Amy Gibbons, Secretary

1986 - 1987
ASSESSMENT OF
SCHOOL SITE BUDGETING PRACTICE
OF THE CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS

A Report on the Implementation of PA 84-126

Compiled by the Staff of the

CHICAGO PANEL

ON PUBLIC SCHOOL POLICY AND FINANCE

Diana Lauber
Assistant Director

G. Alfred Hess, Jr.
Executive Director

With the Research Assistance of:
Carmen Vazquez
Christina A. Warden

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	Page i
Findings	Page iii
Recommendations	Page vi
I. BUDGET HEARING PROCESS - 1986 and 1987 A. Citizen Participation B. Budget Materials C. In-Service Training	Page 1
II. ASSESSMENT OF 1987 BUDGET HEARINGS A. March Budget Meetings B. Panel Survey C. Recommendations and Objections D. The Hearing Review Process E. Second Budget Meetings	Page 6
III. LOCAL SCHOOL ADVISORY COUNCILS A. Adoption of Guidelines B. Survey of Implementation of Local School Improvement Councils	Page 12
IV. SIGNIFICANCE FOR THE FUTURE	Page 16

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 1985 legislation, introduced by House Speaker Michael Madigan creating Local School Improvement Councils (LSIC) and annual local school budget hearings, laid the foundation for meaningful citizen involvement in the Chicago Public Schools. This legislation had two components:

1) Annual school site budget hearings required in each Chicago Public School in which citizens, parents, and teachers vote on the proposed school budget for the following year

2) The creation of Local School Improvement councils (LSIC) at each public school with specific rights and responsibilities over curriculum, personnel, and budget issues

Last spring, the Chicago Panel on Public School Policy and Finance published *School Budget Hearing Assessment*, a comprehensive assessment of the first year's implementation of school site budget hearings. The other component of PA 84-126, Local School Improvement Councils, were so minimally implementated that the Panel could not adequately evaluate them until this year.

The central finding of the Panel's 1986 assessment was that the Chicago Public Schools adequately implemented the first year of the local budget hearings except for its unwillingness to change any budgets to meet local school objections. However, the report also pointed to numerous problems which needed to be corrected in order to fully implement this aspect of PA 84-126.

This second report assesses the Board's success in implementing both the Budget Hearing and the Local School Improvement Council requirements of PA 84-126 during its second year of implementation.

The major finding of this second assessment is that the Chicago Board of Education has not adequately implemented either component of PA 84-126 and gives little indication that it has any intention of doing so in the future. Although there have been considerable improvements made in the budget materials sent home to parents and those used at the hearings, and a genuine effort to involve Local School Improvement Council presidents in Board provided budget workshops; these changes only involve process and do not change the product. The second budget hearings were a sham in 1986 and they were a sham in 1987. The administration continues to obstruct the Local School Improvement Councils' ability to function as intended by the legislation. The central recommendation of this assessment is that the Illinois Legislature must hold the Board fully accountable to see that this legislation is implemented as intented, and if the Board's actions are not acceptable, other legislation to strengthen local accountability and school improvement must be forthcoming.

Other findings contained in this report and discussed in the following pages are:

More than 9,000 people attended local school budget hearings in 1987.
The Board adjusted no budgets for the second year.
The decrease in rejected budgets did not indicate an increase in community satisfaction with the public schools.
Hispanic parents used the budget hearing disapproval process to voice their complaints at twice the rate of other parents.
The local budget hearings were conducted more effectively this year largely due to duel training of principals and LSIC presidents.
The narrow definition of discretionary funds has seriously diminished the Local School Improvement Councils' power.

In addition to the legislature holding the Board accountable for its inactions in implementing PA 84-126, the Panel recommends:

Redefining the term "discretionary" to include all teaching positions in excess of those required to meet contractual teacher-pupil ratios, including those provided through Chapter 1 and State Bilingual funds.
District Superintendents must closely monitor Local School Improvement Council guidelines as implemented by the school principals.
The Chicago Board of Education must move towards allowing important decisions about education to take place at the local school and in doing so, initiate a three year pilot project in local school autonomy to accomplish this goal.

FINDINGS

1. THE BOARD HAS FAILED TO MEET THE INTENTION OF PA 84-126 IN ITS IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SCHOOL SITE BUDGET HEARINGS.

Although many improvements recommended by the City-Wide Committee on School Budgeting were implemented in 1987, the intention of PA 84-126 to significantly advance school accountability was not met. The Board's Department of Financial Planning and Budgeting incorporated in its materials many of the recommended changes to make the budget documents more understandable. LSIC presidents were included in the budget hearing in-service training events and were welcomed as partners in the hearing process. A new review process was put in place which was intended to aid those at the local level in meeting the objections of the voters at schools which disapproved their budgets. Although the budget hearing mechanics improved significantly over 1986, the outcomes did not. Several top administrators, principals, and Board members publicly demeaned the budget hearing process by encouraging the idea that it is was a waste of time and by misrepresenting the actual costs of budget hearing preparation.

2. THIS YEAR, 9,083 PEOPLE ATTENDED LOCAL SCHOOL BUDGET HEARINGS, 2,185 FEWER THAN IN 1986.

Over 9,000 people chose to participate in local school hearings despite active discouragement of parents by the top leadership of the Chicago Public Schools, from the General Superintendent downwards. However, many people across the city decided not to attend the 1987 budget hearings because of their disappointment at last year's hearing results.

3. AS IN 1986, THE BOARD ADJUSTED NO REJECTED BUDGETS.

The Chicago Board of Education was charged to "modify the budget as near as possible to meet the objections of the voters at the meeting." For the second year in a row, no school budgets were adjusted. Although a process for reviewing objections raised was put in place this year, many administrators put off the hearing review meeting disregarding the Board's guidelines to hold all review meetings by March 27th; others approached the meeting with the same lack of good faith as was evident last year. Again the overwhelming number of objections concerned inadequate textbook and supply funding, and again these objections were met with standardized responses.

4. FEWER BUDGETS WERE DISAPPROVED THIS YEAR BECAUSE PARTICIPANTS LACKED FAITH THAT THE BOARD WOULD REVISE REJECTED BUDGETS.

In 1986, 66 schools rejected their budgets; in 1987, only 43 rejected them. Some Board members and administrators have interpreted the decrease in disapproved budgets as an increase in citizen

satisfaction. However, participants at many schools who voted to approve their budgets expressed the same dissatisfaction with textbook, supply, and educational equipment allocations as those who disapproved their budgets. Because no budgets were adjusted at the second budget hearings last April, and the 1987 textbook and supply funds were cut even after the community expressed a need for increased funding, many participants felt it was futile to disapprove their budgets.

5. **TWICE AS MANY PREDOMINATELY HISPANIC SCHOOLS REJECTED THEIR 1987 BUDGETS AS DID EITHER PREDOMINATELY BLACK OR WHITE SCHOOLS.**

Hispanic parents used the budget hearing process to complain about the conditions of their schools to a far greater extent than either Black or White parents. In proportion to their total numbers, 12% of all predominately Hispanic Schools (50% or more Hispanic) rejected their budgets compared to 6% of all predominately Black and 6% of all predominately White schools.

6. **THE MANAGEMENT OF THIS YEAR'S BUDGET HEARINGS WAS MUCH IMPROVED. LSIC PRESIDENTS AND PRINCIPALS SHARED THE ROLE OF PRESENTOR AT THE BUDGET HEARINGS, AND PARTICIPANTS RECEIVED BETTER AND MORE ACCURATE INFORMATION.**

Because of the improved in-service training provided to both LSIC presidents and principals, many school principals and LSIC presidents felt a sense of partnership. This year, a considerable number of LSIC presidents conducted their meetings. There was not the same feeling of confusion about budgets as expressed last year. LSIC presidents were much more confident about their role in the hearings and better informed, and principals did a better job.

7. **THE IMPLEMENTATION OF LOCAL SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT COUNCIL LEGISLATION HAS BEEN UNNECESSARILY SLOW, UNEVENLY CARRIED OUT, AND UNDERMINDED BY LACK OF SUPPORT FROM THE GENERAL SUPERINTENDENT.**

Almost two years after the passage of the legislation which mandated Local School Improvement Councils, many councils are only minimally operational. Despite the legal requirement to do so, a majority of the councils surveyed by the Panel this Spring had never had a proposal to spend discretionary funds submitted to them by their building principals. Councils were unevenly obeying the mandates of the legislation and the Board's guidelines. Council composition and principal attendance at meetings in many schools did not follow the requirements as mandated by law. The General Superintendent has been openly opposed to sharing authority. In a public meeting, instead of emphasizing the value of a democratic process, the General Superintendent, referring to a specific school, characterized parental involvement in the budget process as, "we're letting parents turn down requests for textbooks for their children."

8. **THE BOARD GAVE LIP SERVICE TO ENCOURAGING MEANINGFUL COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT WHILE AT THE SAME TIME EXCLUDED CHAPTER I AND STATE BILINGUAL FUNDS FROM THE APPROVED LIST OF DISCRETIONARY FUNDS, THUS SERIOUSLY UNDERMINING THE ABILITY OF LOCAL SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT COUNCILS TO PARTICIPATE IN REAL SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT.**

The Board severely weakened the powers of the Local School Improvement Councils by disallowing Chapter I and State Bilingual funds from the list of discretionary funds. These disallowed funds accounted for millions of dollars of programs at the local level. Ways to resolve the complaints of ECIA and Bilingual Council members could have been found, but the Board chose to hide behind the complaints and thus weaken parental and community involvement.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **THE CHICAGO BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD BE REQUIRED TO REPORT ANNUALLY TO THE LEGISLATURE ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PA 84-126.**

   The Illinois State Board of Education has been charged with implementing the 1985 reform legislation. It has not provided any measureable oversight of this important legislation mandating Local School Improvement Councils and annual budget hearings. By refusing to judge the adequacy of the Board's interpretation of discretionary funds, the State Board has abdicated its role. Furthermore, when the Chicago Board of Education made no effort, good faith or otherwise, to meet the objections of those school communities which rejected their budgets both last year and in 1987, the State Board declined to enforce this part of the legislation.

2. **THE TERM "DISCRETIONARY FUNDS" SHOULD BE REDEFINED TO INCLUDE ALL TEACHING POSITIONS IN EXCESS OF THOSE REQUIRED TO MEET CONTRACTUAL PUPIL-TEACHER RATIOS, INCLUDING THOSE PROVIDED THROUGH CHAPTER I AND STATE BILINGUAL FUNDS.**

   Discretionary funds have been so narrowly defined as to create the impression that Local School Improvement Councils have no real arenas of authority. The definition should be changed to read "discretionary programming and funds" to include all non-quota instructional positions. Chapter I and State Bilingual funds account for the vast majority of discretionary funds and their exclusion weakens the Local School Improvement Councils. The concern expressed by ECIA and Bilingual Council leaders over loss of autonomy is understandable, but their interests can be served and the legislative intent of PA 84-126 can remain intact by including these funds as discretionary. Local School Improvement Councils should include members of their school's ECIA and/or Bilingual council in their membership.

3. **DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENTS MUST CLOSELY MONITOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF GUIDELINES CONCERNING LOCAL SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT COUNCILS TO SEE THAT ALL PRINCIPALS ARE FOLLOWING THEM.**

   There is a cavalier disregard by many principals concerning the rights of Local School Improvement Councils. Many LSIC presidents are confused by the guidelines and are not sure of their new rights and responsibilities. This is further exacerbated by principals who ignore or partially follow both the mandates, as described in the law, and the Board guidelines. Almost two years after this legislation was mandated, an alarming number of councils have been deprived of their rights.

4. **THE CHICAGO BOARD OF EDUCATION MUST MOVE TOWARDS MAKING THE INDIVIDUAL SCHOOL THE PLACE WHERE A SIGNIFICANT NUMBER OF DECISIONS ABOUT THE EDUCATION OF CHILDREN TAKES PLACE. TO DO THIS THE BOARD SHOULD INITIATE A THREE YEAR PILOT PROJECT IN LOCAL SCHOOL AUTONOMY BEGINNING IN THE FALL OF 1987.**

Beginning in 1987, a city-wide committee should be established to select at least 46 schools, two from each district, to participate in a voluntary pilot project over a three year period. A school management council should be established at each school in the project with considerable authority over curriculum, personnel and budget issues. This council should be half parents and residents and half staff, primarily teachers and the building principal. Each council should make a needs assessment of the school and build a school improvement plan based upon that assessment. The city-wide committee should monitor, assist, and evaluate the pilot project.

1986 - 1987
ASSESSMENT OF
SCHOOL SITE BUDGETING PRACTICE

THE CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS

A Narrative Report

I. Budget Hearing Process - 1986 and 1987

This section of the report evaluates the Chicago Board of Education's response to recommendations for improvement made in the Panel's 1986 assessment report and evaluates the 1987 budget hearing process.

A. Citizen Participation

1986: Last year, the Panel reported that 11,268 parents, teachers, community members and others attended the local budget hearings held at 537 schools across the city. Despite active discouragement by many district and school level staff, citizens came out in record numbers to find out about and vote on their 1986-87 local school budget. This active discouragement took several forms:

1) Some high level administrators and school principals dismissed the process as time wasting, costly, and serving no purpose. Some district superintendents made it clear that if a school disapproved its budget, it would reflect badly on the local principal.

2) Many principals discouraged participation by misleadingly telling the parents that only two or three percent of the budget could be changed and that they could have no influence on the programs offered at their school.

3) Some local school parent leaders, influenced by school officials, discouraged participation by repeating the incorrect story about what could be changed in the school budget, implying that coming to the hearings was a waste of time. In fact, on the night of the hearings, some parent leaders asked the meeting participants to approve the budget so they would not have to hold a second meeting which would cost the system money and make their principals look bad.

1987: This year 9,083 people attended the budget hearings, 2,000 fewer than last year. This may seem to be a disappointing number when, if fact, it is remarkable. Despite the active discouragement of parents both last year and this year, the failure of the Board to respond to any disapproved budgets in 1986, and the Board's disregard for the overwhelming need for textbook and supply increases as expressed by citizens across the city during the 1986 budget hearings, thousands of people attended their local budget hearings.

There were two very different attitudes about citizen participation by top administrators this year. Some administrators, district superintendents and principals actively encouraged parents and citizens to participate in the hearings and to use the hearings as an opportunity to let the schools <u>hear</u> from the community. They openly encouraged the kind of partnership between the community and the schools that PA 84-126 intended.

The 1987 City-wide Committe on School Budget Hearings, the committee charged by the General Superintendent to recommend guidelines for the budget hearings, exemplified this openness and cooperation. The 1986 City-wide Committee on School Budget Hearings was comprised exclusively of principals and representatives from the district and central administration. In 1987, the membership of the City-wide Committee was expanded to include three LSIC presidents and representatives from three civic/community organizations, including the Panel. The City-wide Committee, and especially the committee chair, Frank Lucentes, were very responsive to recommendations for improving the budget process made by the Panel and other committee members. Because of this committee's work, changes in procedures and budget materials were made to improve the budget hearings and respond to the criticism made after last year's hearings.

While this was very encouraging, district and school level staff still practiced the same kind of active discouragement during the 1987 budget hearings as was documented in the 1986 report.

Some administrative staff, including the General Superintendent, portrayed the hearings as a time for the community to be <u>told</u> by the schools and not a time for the schools to <u>hear</u> from parents about changes or improvements to the budgets or school programs which were desired. Dismissing the hearings as simply a time for citizens to learn about their schools undermined the concepts of school accountability and meaningful citizen participation; thus, the Board really conducted <u>tellings</u> rather than <u>hearings.</u>

Some Board members along with some top administrative staff further discouraged the budget hearing process by publicly depicting the hearings as a burdensome and useless annoyance which was *costing the system over one million dollars a year.* When the Panel challenged this figure, budget staff checked their figures and reported that it actually cost one half million dollars a year. However, even the half million dollar figure was inflated: first, by charging normal staff time against the budget hearing costs, and secondly, by assuming that 50% of the schools would have second budget hearings and based calculated costs on that assumption. Except for custodians who worked in the evening during the first and second budget hearings, other personnel simply worked their normal time period. The real cost was approximately $154,875 in 1986 and $171,067 in 1987. (See Table I).

B. Budget Materials

1986: Although the Department of Financial Planning and Budgeting did an admirable job last year in preparing materials in a short time, parents and other citizens found the materials which they received difficult to understand. According to the legislation, the LSICs are

Table I

CHICAGO BOARD OF EDUCATION'S ESTIMATED SCHOOL BASE BUDGETING COSTS AND THE CHICAGO PANEL'S RESPONSE

I. MARCH BUDGET HEARING COSTS	BOARD OF ED 1986 FIGURES	CHICAGO PANEL 1986 FIGURES	BOARD OF ED 1987 FIGURES	CHICAGO PANEL 1987 FIGURES
A. Personnel costs:				
Cost of custodians, engineers, and school maintenance assistants for March Budget Hearings	$125,000	$125,000	$143,250	$130,000
Principals in-services, preparation time, meeting (first and second budget hearings), and assessment of vote results	259,500	0	64,550	0
District superintendents in-service and preparation time	6,400	0	10,522	0
School Clerks time for duplication, dissemination and tabulation of hearing results	80,600	0	92,368	0
Budget Department/Operation Analysis time: two months times director, budget manager, budget staff, and operations analysis time plus other central office staff time	29,100	0	83,920	0
B. Materials Costs:				
Duplication, printing and distribution costs	15,555	15,555	23,267	23,267
Public Announcements	1,000	1,000	10,000	10,000
C. Second Budget Hearing Personnel Costs:				
Board figures assume 50% of schools held second hearings. Panel figures reflect actual numbers.	75,000	14,875	85,950	7,800
TOTAL COSTS FOR BUDGET HEARINGS	$592,155	$156,430	$513,827	$171,067
COST PER SCHOOL (531)	$1,115	$295	$968	$322

responsible for conducting the budget hearings; however, the LSIC members did not understand the budget documents, for the most part, nor did they receive their documents in time to get help in analyzing them.

1987: Because of the cooperation and hard work of the Director of the Department of Financial Planning and Budgeting and her staff, many changes were made in the budget materials to make them more understandable by citizens and building staff. The changes were made in several areas:

1) Language - many specific words which confused parents last year were replaced with more understandable terms.
2) Format - changes in document format were made to avoid last year's confusion.
3) Material - in 1986, a budget summary was sent home to parents which was confusing and did little to enlighten them about their school's budget. This year, parents received a program budget which showed how many staff and what costs were assigned to each educational program in the school. They also received a narrative explanation defining terms used in the summary. In addition, they received a summary of their school's discretionary funds, which are subject to disapproval by the Local School Improvement Council.

C. In-service Training

1986: Only principals received training in preparation for the 1986 budget hearings. This training did not emphasize encouraging parental participation. There were many principals who were resistant to the budget in-service workshops and to the whole concept of school based budgeting and who performed poorly at their local school budget hearings.

1987: In addition to training principals, in-service workshops this year involved district administrators, district council presidents, and LSIC presidents. A city-wide workshop was held in January to which district superintendents, one principal from each district, and the district educational advisory council presidents were invited. They received training on the budget hearing process, guidelines, and budget documents.

In turn, in-service training was provided at each district by the staff of the Department of Financial Planning and Budgeting, a member of the district administrator's staff, the principal who attended the city-wide workshop, and the district educational advisory council president. Other central office staff were available for specific questions. School principals and their LSIC presidents received joint training at these district level training sessions. Parent leaders received valuable training to help them conduct the budget hearings, and they and their principals received the same information at the same time, helping to eliminate much of the misinformation prevalent during last year's hearings.

It was the responsibility of the district superintendents to notify their principals to attend their district in-service workshops. The principals, in turn, were responsible for notifying their LSIC presidents of the date and purpose of the workshops.

Although the recommendation to hold joint training sessions was approved by the Superintendent, the implementation of the sessions was not without problems. The early joint district-level in-services were not well attended by LSIC presidents; many presidents were either not informed or informed at the last minute by their principals. One district administration, in disregard for the guidelines established by the Superintendent concerning the joint workshops, planned two workshops, one for principals and one for LSIC presidents. When the Chicago Panel pointed out this problem to appropriate Board personnel, the district superintendent invited parents to both sessions. It came as no surprise that few parents attended the principals' session, since they were invited at the last minute, it was held during an afternoon on which their children were not in school, and it was held in a location far from their homes, outside the district.

For the most part, district superintendents did an adequate to excellent job of informing their principals of the in-service and overseeing the actual training. One district superintendent went even further and notified each LSIC president by mail, emphasizing the importance of the presidents' role during the budget hearings. For the most part, in those places where communication to parent leaders was inadequate or lacking, the fault rested with the building principal. Of the 163 LSIC presidents surveyed by the Panel concerning their participation in the in-service training workshops, 70% had attended the workshops. Several others were invited but did not attend, and still others were not invited.

Throughout the 55 presentations and workshops Panel staff gave to prepare LSIC members for the 1987 budget hearing, the Panel found a change in parents' attitudes towards the hearings. Parents were much more enthusiastic and interested this year. The school-level training sessions given by the Panel last year averaged seven to eight parents; this year, the average was 25 to 30 parents. Parents wanted information so they could participate in the hearings rather than be passive observers.

The dual training of principals and LSIC presidents at the Board-sponsored workshops engendered much of this enthusiasm. Including the LSIC presidents in the workshops reinforced the importance of their role in the budget process. Additionally, each LSIC president received the same budget packet as his/her principal. Last year, the LSIC presidents only received the same material that all other parents received just two weeks prior to the hearings. The 1987 packets contained one copy of all the local school budget material which would be used at the hearings, providing the LSIC presidents with ample material and sufficient time to prepare for the hearings. LSIC presidents and principals also received two booklets prepared by the Department of Financial Planning and Budgeting. One of these booklets, *Guide to School Budget Hearings*, contained valuable information for both the principals and LSIC presidents.

II. ASSESSMENT OF 1987 BUDGET HEARINGS

A. March Budget Meetings

On March 10th and 12th, the Chicago Board of Education held its second annual School Site Budget Hearings in 451 elementary and 73 high schools across the city. According to Board figures released in March, 1987 a total of 9,083 parents, teachers, residents, and other interested persons attended these hearings. In 1987, parents represented 52% of the total which was similar to 1986 figures. Teachers represented 29% of the total, a 5% drop from last year. Residents comprised 6% of the total, close to last year's figure of 7%, and others represented 12% of the total, up from 8% last year. There was greater teacher representation at the elementary schools than the high schools - 31% in elementary and 21% in high schools. Conversely, there was greater parent representation at the high school level with 61% parents compared to 52% at the elementary hearings.

Seventy-nine percent of those voting at the high schools approved their budgets while 19% disapproved and 3% abstained. The approval rate at the elementary schools was 80% with 14% disapproving and 7% abstaining. For all school heraings, 7,254 voted to approve their local school budgets (80%) while 1,244 (14%) voted to disapprove and 585 (6%) abstained. A total of 481 schools (92%) approved their budget, 41 disapproved and two tied (a tie was considered a disapproval). Last year, 67 (13%) out of 537 schools disapproved their budget, including six tie votes.

In the 43 schools which rejected their budgets, 75% of those in attendance were parents compared to 53% parent attendance in all schools. An overwhelming number of parents, 89%, voted to reject their school budgets. Ninety-two percent of residents and 79% of other voted to disapprove. On the other hand, only 44% of the teachers disapproved the budgets in these 43 schools.

DISAPPROVED BUDGETS: VOTES BY CATEGORY

	PARENTS	%	RESIDENTS	%	TEACHERS	%	OTHER	%	TOTAL	
APPROVE	82	11%	5	8%	76	56%	9	21%	172	18%
DISAPRROVE	645	89%	55	92%	60	44%	34	79%	794	82%
TOTAL	727		60		136		43		966	

Actual school level data were supplied by the Board of Education in April, 1986 and published in the Panel's 1986 assessment report. This data contained individual school attendance and voting records. The guidelines published by the Board clearly state that the results of the budget hearing will be telephoned to the district superintendent within 48 hours after the votes are tabulated and sumitted in writing to the district office within 5 working days. After several calls to the Department of Operations Analysis and Planning, the Panel was informed that the data received at the district offices was inaccurate and the principals were asked to resubmit the accurate data. According to the Director of the Department of Operations Analysis and Planning, many principals submitted voting records in which the number of people in attendance was identical to the number of people voting. Since principals cannot vote, every school should have had at least one more in attendance than the number who voted. There was also confusion concerning the categories of eligible voters. Some of the voters fit more than one category (parents who voted under residents or parents who were also teachers in the school). There were few reported problems concerning this issue in 1986 and no explanation given for the confusion this year.

The Panel finally received the revised data included in this report almost three months after the hearings. At that time the Panel staff was told that the information was still incomplete and not totally accurate. The school level budget hearing data prepared by the Board is in Appendix I. The Panel has attempted to correct obvious errors in the Board's calculations in these tables.

B. Panel Survey

In late February, 1987, the Panel mailed surveys to all LSIC presidents and followed up with phone calls beginning in March and concluding in May. (See Appendix II) The survey had two parts: the first part contained questions about the 1987 budget hearings and the second part contained questions about the work of the Local School Improvement Councils. From the 535 LSICs on file with the Illinois State Board of Education, 137 presidents (26%) responded to the survey questions on the 1987 budget hearings.

Attendance: According to Chicago Board reports, 9,083 persons attended budget hearings; 57% were parents, 35% were teachers, 9% were residents, and 6% others. A total of 2,335 persons attended the hearings held in the survey's 137 schools. Of these, 57% were parents, 35% teachers, 9% residents, and 6% others. The surveyed schools had a higher number of persons disapproving the proposed budget than the city-wide figure - 65% voted to approve and 26% voted to disapprove. Of the 137 schools, school budgets in 27 schools were rejected, a higher ratio than the city-wide data. (See Appendix III)

Hearing Management: Most responding LSIC presidents felt the hearings were conducted well, the budget explanations were adequate and most questions were sufficiently answered. Many presidents expressed confidence in their ability to explain the budget and lead the meeting. Others stressed that, at the school level, the tensions, unpreparedness and antagonisms were gone and in their place was a sense of partnership. This is in strong contrast to last year's hearings when many principals and most parents were confused and poorly informed, with the exception of the parents trained at Region PTA and Panel workshops. This year, the Panel again provided workshops to prepare parents and other residents for the budget hearings. These workshops, coupled with the joint LSIC president and principal workshops sponsored by the Board, resulted in better informed parents and principals. Unlike the 1986 budget hearings when no LSIC president conducted the the budget portion of the meeting, 24% of the hearings were conducted by LSIC presidents and 46% were jointly conducted by the presidents and principals. Only 32% of the hearings were solely conducted by the principals.

While it was encouraging to have many more presidents and principals well informed about the mechanics of the budget hearing, few principals strayed from the rhetoric of formulas and union contract restrictions as reasons for being unable to change their budgets. Many LSIC presidents were primed to tackle their budgets and talk about school improvement at the hearings and instead were met with the same resistance as last year. The presidents had studied their schools' discretionary budgets and yet were told that even funds for textbooks and supplies could not be changed because they were set by formula, again ignoring the fact that funds for these areas could be increased and had, indeed, increased in the past.

Parents were also told overtly and covertly that disapproving the budget was a waste of time, it cost the system money to hold a second budget hearing, and it reflected badly on the principal. In fact, one LSIC president reported that when her principal's budget was disapproved, he publicly said that if he knew his budget was going to be disapproved he would have made more teachers come to the hearing and vote for approval. Other presidents reported that their principals asked the teachers to come to the hearings and vote for approval.

C. Recommendations and Objections: The following is a list of recommendations and/or objections raised at the local budget hearings as reported by the surveyed LSIC presidents. In those surveys where comments were given, 16 presidents reported that no one made any recommendations or had objections; however, 88 other presidents reported the following comments:

55% recommended extra funds for textbooks
50% recommended extra funds for supplies
50% recommended extra funds for maintenance and repairs
32% recommended increases in staff
32% recommended increases for furniture and equipment
21% recommended more or different programs
16% recommended better prepared lunches
13% recommended more funds for computers and software

Last year the Panel recorded comments only from those schools that disapproved their budgets. The above comments were made by persons in schools that approved as well as disapproved their budgets. Participants overwhelmingly voiced the need for more textbooks and supplies just as was the case in 1986. One difference is noted in the increase in recommendations for better maintenance and repairs seen in 50% of the schools in which objections were made. (See Appendix III)

Many parents reported to the Panel that disapproving their budget was futile since the Board would not change anything. This was reinforced over and over again by different principals, administrators, and parent leaders who made the same statement even on the night of the budget hearings. The Board was mistaken, however, to believe that having fewer disapproved budgets meant people were more content than last year. The Panel survey clearly indicates that even those who approved their budgets, many times because they thought that disapproving it was a futile act, were in no way content with their present situation.

D. The Hearing Review Process

An important change in procedure recommended by the City-Wide Committee on Budget Hearings was the review process for schools with disapproved budgets. After a school budget was rejected, that school's principal, Local School Improvement Council president, the district superintendent, and the district educational advisory council president were to meet, before March 27th, in order to discuss the reasons for disapproval and collectively try to find budget remedies for these problems. It was then the responsibility of the district superintendent to forward these recommendations to the General Superintendent. The district superintendent's recommendations and the Board's response would then be presented at the second budget hearing.

While this new process held great promise for the kind of enhanced decision-making at the local level encouraged in PA 84-126, even its implementation was obstructed and compromised. In late March, after several parents complained to the Panel that the hearing review process had not been held at their school, Panel staff contacted many district administrators and principals of schools with rejected budgets to find out when their review meetings would be held. Several of the principals and district administrators were quite annoyed at the Panel for asking and were very vague about when the meetings would be held. The Panel was able to gather information from 27 of the 43 schools which were supposed to hold second budget hearings.

Of the 27 LSIC presidents or principals contacted during this period; only twelve (44%) had met on or before March 27th. The Panel also learned that the district advisory council president in at least one district (District 5) had not been invited or informed of her role in the process. Many of the disapproved schools held their hearing reviews during the last few days before the second budget hearings, indicating not only a disregard for the guidelines, but also a cavalier attitude about the importance of the hearing review process. An LSIC president in District 3 who had inquired about her school's hearing review date was told by a district administrator that since the review had not been held by the 27th, the recommendations made at the review would be meaningless.

E. Second Budget Meetings

Budgets at forty-one schools were disapproved along with tie votes at two schools, Pasteur and McDowell. According to legislation, a tie vote is to be treated as a disapproval. The law states:

> "When the budget is rejected by a simple majority or a tie vote of those voting, each School Council shall conduct a second meeting within the time period and for the purpose specified in Section 34-18b(2) of The School Code."

However, the March 20, 1987 Board report which described the outcome of the second annual budget hearing, omitted the two tied schools from the list of individual school data on disapproved budgets. (See Appendix IV) In fact, one of the tied schools, McDowell, never held the second budget hearing as mandated by law. After the first budget hearing, the McDowell LSIC president asked her principal about the second budget hearing date. The principal knew nothing about it. When the LSIC president called the district office, she was told there was not going to be a second meeting.

On April 6th and 9th, forty-two schools met for the second time to receive the Board's response to their objections. Because of the dual training of LSIC presidents and principals, the hearing review process, and the severe criticism the Board received in 1986 for not altering any budgets, parents were hopeful that this year some budgets would be revised. The Board did not change any budgets, and for the second year the Chicago Board of Education completely disregarded both the spirit and letter of the law by not even attempting to make "modify the budget as near as possible to meet the objections of the voters at the meeting. The Board again insulted and enraged the community by portraying itself as wanting meaningful community involvement and then obstructing every opportunity for it to take place.

The Board has been severely criticized by the community as well as the Panel for ignoring the needs expressed during the 1986 hearings for more textbooks and supplies while reducing those funds in the 1987 budget. In answer to this criticism, the Board has asked the legislature to increase the tax rate in the Textbook Fund thus showing, in their own words, how "accountable" they are to the community. Raising taxes is not the Panel's idea of accountability; however, reallocating funds and reprioritizing the budget is.

The one positive change which took place at the second budget hearings was that, unlike last year, participants were asked to vote on the budget at the second budget hearing. While this vote was only advisory, it allowed participants another opportunity to let the Board hear from them. Of the schools for which the Panel has data, 54% approved the second budget and 46% disapproved it. (See Appendix V)

III. LOCAL SCHOOL ADVISORY COUNCILS

A. Adoption of Guidelines

School Year 1985-86: Although the legislation which mandated Local School Improvement Councils was passed in the summer of 1985, the Chicago Board of Education did little more than allow councils to be established during 1985-86. The legislation called for the establishment of local councils early in the fall, but it was not until November of 1985 that the Deputy Superintendent of Schools convened a committee of parents and other citizen leaders to consider guidelines for the LSICs and District Educational Advisory Councils. The guidelines were adopted in late January, 1986. While councils were established last winter, they did not function as was intended either in the spirit or the letter of the law. Few if any LSICs actually conducted the local school budget hearings and no LSIC was allowed to disapprove the principal's discretionary funds in 1986. The excuse given for this inaction was that the Chicago Board of Education had not approved the list of programs and funds which were considered discretionary. Until the Board approved a list, the councils were considered to have no disapproval rights.

During the winter and spring of 1986, the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) clearly stated to the Panel and to the Chicago Board of Education the range of items which were to be considered discretionary. In April, 1986, the Deputy Superintendent released a bulletin which stated that only supplies and textbooks and gifts or grants in the principal's internal accounts of less than $1,000 were considered discretionary at the local level. This list was not accepted by the Illinois State Board of Education. In a letter to the Deputy Superintendent and again in conversations with Panel staff, the ISBE clearly stated that those funds considered discretionary included: supplementary State Title I, gifted, desegregation, Chapter I and State Bilingual funds along with textbooks, supplies, and the entire principal's internal accounts.

School Year 1986-87: Finally, in the fall of 1986, more than a year after the passage of this legislation, the Deputy Superintendent and a committee of staff, parent and civic leaders agreed to a list of discretionary funds closely matching ISBE's with two exceptions:

1) Only money used for instructional materials and supplies for gifted programs would be considered discretionary.

2) Only if the principal had authority to determine how desegregation funds were spent would those funds be considered discretionary. However, if the decision on fund use was made at the Central Office, then the desegregation program funds were not considered discretionary.

In December, 1986, the members of the Chicago Board of Education voted to exclude ECIA Chapter I funds and State Bilingual funds as part of the approved list of discretionary funds. ECIA council leaders had complained to the Board that defining Chapter I funds as discretionary would diminish the ECIA local advisory councils' influence over programs designed to serve disadvantaged students.

The Chicago Panel protested this serious exclusion for several reasons. The ECIA advisory councils are no longer mandated by federal law and exist in Chicago at the whim of the Board; they have no legal standing or rights of disapproval as do Local School Advisory Councils. The Chicago Board of Education had been extremely reticent to implement the legislation requiring local school councils and according them disapproval rights over discretionary funds. Furthermore, because Chapter I and State Bilingual monies accounted for the vast majority of discretionary funds (this is especially true in schools most in need of school improvement), excluding them greatly diminishes the new powers accorded to parents and citizens to improve their local schools. Furthermore, the exclusion of staff position choices which are made by the principal, from the arena of discretion, also greatly diminishes citizen involvement in shaping a local school education program which will be responsive to the needs of a neighborhood's children.

The Illinois State Board of Education abdicated its authority by refusing to become involved in this development. In a letter sent by the Illinois State Board to the Deputy Superintendent in August, 1986, the State Board's position was quite clear. They wrote, "The key focus to discretionary funds for the district superintendent or the principal is whether they have the authority to approve the expenditure of the funds in question." Clearly, Chapter I and at least some State Bilingual funds fit this description and until December, 1986, the State Board agreed and promoted their inclusion. However, when the Panel protested the school system's exclusion of these funds, the Superintendent of the Illinois State Board of Education responded by saying that the State Board would not involve itself in the determination of which funds were discretionary.

B. Survey of Implementation of Local School Improvement Councils

In order to measure the Board's implementation of Local School Improvement Councils, the Panel surveyed LSIC presidents. (Appendix VI) A survey was sent to each president by mail followed by phone calls from Panel staff members. Approximately one third of the elementary school LSIC presidents (151) and 20% of the high school LSIC presidents (15) responded to this part of the survey, a total of 166 schools. (See Appendix VII)

Council membership: Membership in the LSICs ranged from as few as three to several hundred people. Total membership for the 151 schools which answered this question was 8,770. Approximately 79% were parents, 7% were community members, 12% were teachers, 1.3% were students and less than 1% other. In at least six of the schools surveyed, membership was open to all interested parents, teachers and community members. In these large LSICs, the elected board carried on the work of the council. Approximately 19% of the LSICs had less than 70% parent membership (28), as mandated by PA 84-126, and 18% (27) were totally made up of parents.

Council Meetings: Over 70% of the councils met once a month; 4% met twice a month. Eleven percent met every two months, 7.8% met every three months, and 6% met less than three times a year. Although, according to established guidelines, LSICs were to be in every school by October 15th, two councils surveyed had only met once and one had not met as of May 5, 1987.

Most councils met during the day (61.8%); 15.2% met only at night and 23% meet at times during the day and other times at night. The most frequent place to meet was the local school. Eight-three percent of the LSICs met at their schools while only 3.6% met outside the school even though the law allows for meeting in other public places. Several councils met both in the school and at other public places (13.3%).

Meeting Attendance: Principals or principals' representatives are mandated to attend every meeting of the Local School Improvement Council; however, only 79.9% of those surveyed stated that their principals or representatives always attended their meetings. Another 17.7% sometimes attended their meeting and 2.4% of those survey stated that their principal has never attended their meetings. It is recommended but not mandated that the school engineer and lunchroom manager be invited to LSIC meetings. Of the 165 LSIC presidents who responded to whether either of these staff persons attended their LSIC meetings, 64.8% responded that one or both always attended their meetings, 6.7% sometimes attended and 28.5% never attended or have never been invited to attend the meetings.

Discretionary Funds: As was previously stated in this report, the Chicago Board of Education did little more than establish LSICs in 1985-86. The excuse for this inaction was that the Chicago Board of Education had not adopted a list of discretionary funds and until they did, the councils had no disapproval rights. On November 5, 1986, a list of discretionary funds was finally adopted. As of four to six months later, the time the Panel's survey was taken, less than half (48.5%) of the principals had regulary submitted proposals to their LSICs before spending discretionary funds. Another quarter (22.7%) sometimes submitted proposals before spending from their discretionary funds, and 28.5% had never submitted a proposal to their LSICs before spending from their discretionary funds.

Even as late as May, 1987, some principals were submitting proposals for the first time. Several other presidents informed the Panel that the principals simply asked them to sign off on the expenditures without meeting with the full council. The presidents were told to do this because the principals needed to make the expenditure immediately, thus circumventing meeting with the total council and discussing the expenditure.

According to the Illinois School Code, a Local School Improvement Council has the power to disapprove all obligations or expenditures of the principal's discretionary fund. The principal must submit a written proposal to the council before these appropriations may be expended. If the council fails to adopt a motion to disapprove a proposed expenditure or oblitgation within thirty days of the date specified in a written proposal submitted to the council by the principal, the proposed expenditure or obligation shall be deemed to be acceptable. More than half of the principals in the Panel's survey have either not followed the Illinois School Code or, since November 5th, have not spent any money for textbooks, supplies, supplementary State Title I, instructional materials and supplies for gifted programs, or held fundraisers.

Of the 116 LSICs in the Panel survey to whom proposals have been submitted, only 5 (4%) have ever disapproved a proposal. Two councils disapproved spending for textbooks and supplies, and one for just textbooks. Another council disapproved spending for supplementary State Title I and one disapproved spending from the principal's internal accounts.

Local School Improvement Council Management: All Local School Improvement Councils were to have adopted bylaws no later than two meetings after the initial meeting. A large majority of LSICs in the survey (80%) have done this. Several others are in the process of adopting bylaws sometime this Spring. Over half the LSICs have done needs assessments at their schools and 42.3% have developed school improvement plans. Neither the needs assessments nor school improvement plans are required by law or the Board's guidelines. It is encouraging that the councils are assessing the needs in their schools and developing plans to address them.

IV. SIGNIFICANCE FOR THE FUTURE

The movement to involve citizens in the local schools and in the institutions of public education is not new. What is new is the type of involvement being encouraged in recent years. For the last several decades, most parent and citizen involvement was limited to servicing the schools: raising money through bake sales, volunteering to chaperone class outings, or supplying tutors for the classroom. Only recently has there been an effort to reinvolve parents and community residents in the decision-making process around local urban schools. In smaller school districts in which the members of the Board of Education are more accessible to their neighbors and fellow citizens, such involvement, whether formal or informal, has been maintained. Such has not been true in large urban school systems.

There have been many barriers to meaningful citizen involvement in the Chicago Public Schools. Parents and citizens often feel intimidated when visiting the local school, feeling as if their presence was an intrusion, as if their opinions were not worthy. Parents who have full time jobs, are poor, do not have a car, do not have access to day care, or are raising their children alone are common in urban school systems. All these realities make it difficult to sustain parental involvement.

However, in other cities, these barriers have been overcome through school accountability movements in which parents and citizens are genuinely involved in shaping school improvement and in other school systems in which there is a strong commitment by the administration for shared governance.

After assessing the Board's implementation of PA 84-126 over the last two years, the member organizations of the Chicago Panel believe that the General Superintendent is not committed to shared governance in the Chicago Public Schools nor has the Board shown its desire to involve parents and other citizens in meaningful decision-making at the local level.

The budget hearings have not produced changes in school budgets nor had any effect on school improvement because of the unwillingness of the Board to allow this to happen. The Local School Improvement Councils' discretionary disapproval rights have been so limited in scope that the councils have little power to participate in school improvement. Without a broader interpretation of discretionary funds and a new approach to shared governance at the local level, the intentions of PA 84-126 to bring about school accountability and improvement will continue to be unmet.

APPENDICES

I.	School Site Hearing Results	Page 1
II.	Budget Hearing Survey Form	Page 18
III.	Budget Hearing Survey Results	Page 19
IV.	Disapproved Budgets	Page 25
V.	Second Hearings Advisory Votes	Page 26
VI.	LSIC Survey Form	Page 27
VII.	LSIC Survey Results	Page 28

1987 SCHOOL BUDGET BALLOTING BY DISTRICT
HELD: MARCH 10 & 12, 1987

BOARD FIGURES

DISTRICTS	APPROVAL		TOTAL VOTING		PARENTS		RESIDENTS		TEACHERS		OTHER		NON VOTING
	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	
1	36	0	355	46	202	44	20	0	106	3	21	2	49
2	24	0	616	9	228	7	51	0	306	1	32	0	62
3	24	2	369	26	185	24	11	4	166	2	8	0	46
4	19	1	268	31	149	28	12	2	88	1	19	0	42
5	20	4	311	86	193	65	5	7	103	9	10	3	48
6	19	4	195	184	161	152	7	8	26	13	8	11	55
7	22	1	241	16	113	10	19	3	81	7	25	0	37
8	24	1	408	29	227	26	25	1	137	0	19	2	19
9	22	1	464	30	203	25	18	1	192	2	51	2	56
10	18	2	437	227	179	191	17	19	208	7	38	10	35
11	19	0	245	13	115	6	10	7	92	0	28	0	85
12	22	1	246	50	121	44	24	1	96	3	5	2	22
13	21	0	293	6	157	5	19	0	73	1	44	0	13
14	20	2	196	15	134	11	7	2	45	1	7	0	53
15	19	1	286	20	138	13	19	1	104	6	25	0	27
16	18	1	272	18	139	12	11	1	81	1	41	4	29
17	20	3	304	65	201	48	11	7	73	8	19	2	21
18	26	4	268	77	163	54	16	10	98	15	0	0	14
19	19	2	295	20	139	16	11	2	139	1	15	1	40
20	17	1	221	26	95	9	12	5	89	8	25	4	14
ELEM. TOTALS	429	31	6,290	994	3,242	790	325	81	2,303	89	440	43	767
31	26	0	374	18	170	12	36	3	130	3	38	0	63
32	21	3	240	118	234	101	4	5	1	3	1	9	9
33	21	3	328	82	196	59	26	10	66	10	40	3	35
H.S. TOTALS	68	6	942	218	600	172	66	18	197	16	79	12	107
CITY WIDE TOTALS:	497	37	7,232	1,212	3,842	962	391	99	2,500	105	519	55	874

CORRECTED TOTALS

	APPROVAL		TOTAL VOTING		NON VOTING	TOTAL ATTENDANCE
	YES	NO	YES	NO		
1	35	1	349	49	53	451
2	24	0	617	8	62	687
3	24	2	370	30	46	446
4	19	1	268	31	44	343
5	19	5	311	84	48	443
6	17	4	202	184	55	441
7	18	1	238	20	37	295
8	24	1	408	29	19	456
9	22	1	464	30	56	550
10	18	2	442	227	35	704
11	19	0	245	13	91	349
12	20	3	246	50	22	318
13	21	0	293	6	14	313
14	20	2	193	14	58	265
15	19	1	286	20	27	333
16	18	1	272	18	29	319
17	18	5	304	65	21	390
18	26	4	277	79	14	370
19	19	2	304	20	40	364
20	17	1	221	26	14	261
ELEM. TOTALS	417	37	6,310	1,003	785	8,098
31	26	0	374	18	63	455
32	21	3	240	118	15	373
33	21	3	328	82	38	448
H.S. TOTALS	68	6	942	218	116	1,276
CITY WIDE TOTALS:	485	43	7,252	1,221	901	9,374

Appendix I

-1-

1987 SCHOOL BUDGET BALLOTING PERCENTAGES BY DISTRICT
HELD: MARCH 10 & 12, 1987

BOARD FIGURES

DISTRICTS	APPROVAL YES	APPROVAL NO	TOTAL VOTING YES	TOTAL VOTING NO	PARENTS YES	PARENTS NO	RESIDENTS YES	RESIDENTS NO	TEACHERS YES	TEACHERS NO	OTHER YES	OTHER NO	NON VOTING
1	100.00%	0.00%	88.53%	11.47%	82.11%	17.89%	100.00%	0.00%	97.25%	2.75%	91.30%	8.70%	11.48%
2	100.00%	0.00%	98.56%	1.44%	97.02%	2.98%	100.00%	0.00%	99.67%	0.33%	100.00%	0.00%	9.02%
3	92.31%	1.07%	93.42%	6.58%	88.52%	11.48%	73.33%	26.67%	98.81%	1.19%	100.00%	0.00%	10.43%
4	95.00%	0.67%	89.63%	10.37%	84.18%	15.82%	85.71%	14.29%	98.88%	1.12%	100.00%	0.00%	12.83%
5	83.33%	2.03%	78.34%	21.66%	74.81%	25.19%	41.67%	58.33%	91.96%	8.04%	76.92%	23.08%	10.79%
6	82.61%	2.42%	51.45%	48.55%	51.44%	48.56%	46.67%	53.33%	66.67%	33.33%	42.11%	57.89%	12.67%
7	95.65%	0.88%	93.77%	6.23%	91.87%	8.13%	86.36%	13.64%	92.05%	7.95%	100.00%	0.00%	12.59%
8	96.00%	0.44%	93.36%	6.64%	89.72%	10.28%	96.15%	3.85%	100.00%	0.00%	90.48%	9.52%	4.17%
9	95.65%	0.49%	93.93%	6.07%	89.04%	10.96%	94.74%	5.26%	98.97%	1.03%	96.23%	3.77%	10.18%
10	90.00%	1.10%	65.81%	34.19%	48.38%	51.62%	47.22%	52.78%	96.74%	3.26%	79.17%	20.83%	5.01%
11	100.00%	0.00%	94.96%	5.04%	95.04%	4.96%	58.82%	41.18%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	26.07%
12	95.65%	0.82%	83.11%	16.89%	73.33%	26.67%	96.00%	4.00%	96.97%	3.03%	71.43%	28.57%	6.92%
13	100.00%	0.00%	97.99%	2.01%	96.91%	3.09%	100.00%	0.00%	98.65%	1.35%	100.00%	0.00%	4.47%
14	90.91%	1.47%	92.89%	7.11%	92.41%	7.59%	77.78%	22.22%	97.83%	2.17%	100.00%	0.00%	21.56%
15	95.00%	0.72%	93.46%	6.54%	91.39%	8.61%	95.00%	5.00%	94.55%	5.45%	100.00%	0.00%	8.11%
16	94.74%	0.71%	93.79%	6.21%	92.05%	7.95%	91.67%	8.33%	98.78%	1.22%	91.11%	8.89%	9.09%
17	86.96%	1.47%	82.38%	17.62%	80.72%	19.28%	61.11%	38.89%	90.12%	9.88%	90.48%	9.52%	5.38%
18	86.67%	2.40%	77.68%	22.32%	75.12%	24.88%	61.54%	38.46%	86.73%	13.27%	N/A	N/A	3.90%
19	90.48%	1.42%	93.65%	6.35%	89.68%	10.32%	84.62%	15.38%	99.29%	0.71%	93.75%	6.25%	11.27%
20	94.44%	1.04%	89.47%	10.53%	91.35%	8.65%	70.59%	29.41%	91.75%	8.25%	86.21%	13.79%	5.36%
ELEM. TOTALS	93.26%	0.95%	86.35%	13.65%	80.41%	19.59%	80.05%	19.95%	96.28%	3.72%	91.10%	8.90%	9.72%
31	100.00%	0.00%	95.41%	4.59%	93.41%	6.59%	92.31%	7.69%	97.74%	2.26%	100.00%	0.00%	13.86%
32	87.50%	1.27%	67.04%	32.96%	69.85%	30.15%	44.44%	55.56%	25.00%	75.00%	10.00%	90.00%	4.02%
33	87.50%	1.51%	80.00%	20.00%	76.86%	23.14%	72.22%	27.78%	86.84%	13.16%	93.02%	6.98%	8.48%
H.S. TOTALS	91.89%	0.99%	81.21%	18.79%	77.72%	22.28%	78.57%	21.43%	92.49%	7.51%	86.81%	13.19%	9.09%
CITY WIDE TOTALS:	93.07%	0.95%	86.65%	14.35%	79.98%	20.02%	79.63%	20.20%	95.97%	4.03%	90.42%	9.58%	9.63%

CORRECTED TOTALS

DISTRICTS	APPROVAL YES	APPROVAL NO	TOTAL VOTING YES	TOTAL VOTING NO	NON VOTING	TOTAL ATTENDANCE
1	97.22%	2.78%	87.69%	12.31%	11.75%	100.00%
2	100.00%	0.00%	98.72%	1.28%	9.02%	100.00%
3	92.31%	7.69%	92.50%	7.50%	10.31%	100.00%
4	95.00%	5.00%	89.63%	10.37%	12.83%	100.00%
5	79.17%	20.83%	78.73%	21.27%	10.84%	100.00%
6	80.95%	19.05%	52.33%	47.67%	12.47%	100.00%
7	94.74%	5.26%	92.25%	7.75%	12.54%	100.00%
8	96.00%	4.00%	93.36%	6.64%	4.17%	100.00%
9	95.65%	4.35%	93.93%	6.07%	10.18%	100.00%
10	90.00%	10.00%	66.07%	33.93%	4.97%	100.00%
11	100.00%	0.00%	94.96%	5.04%	26.07%	100.00%
12	86.96%	13.04%	83.11%	16.89%	6.92%	100.00%
13	100.00%	0.00%	97.99%	2.01%	4.47%	100.00%
14	90.91%	9.09%	93.24%	6.76%	21.81%	100.00%
15	95.00%	5.00%	93.46%	6.54%	8.11%	100.00%
16	94.74%	5.26%	93.79%	6.21%	9.09%	100.00%
17	78.26%	21.74%	82.38%	17.62%	5.38%	100.00%
18	86.67%	13.33%	77.81%	22.19%	3.78%	100.00%
19	90.48%	9.52%	93.83%	6.17%	10.99%	100.00%
20	94.44%	5.56%	89.47%	10.53%	5.36%	100.00%
ELEM. TOTALS	91.85%	8.15%	86.28%	13.72%	9.69%	100.00%
31	100.00%	0.00%	95.41%	4.59%	13.86%	100.00%
32	87.50%	12.50%	67.04%	32.96%	4.02%	100.00%
33	87.50%	12.50%	80.00%	20.00%	8.48%	100.00%
H.S. TOTALS	91.89%	8.11%	81.21%	18.79%	9.09%	100.00%
CITY WIDE TOTALS:	91.86%	8.14%	85.59%	14.41%	9.61%	100.00%

N/A: NO PERCENTAGES ARE AVAILABLE BECAUSE NO "OTHERS" WERE PRESENT AT THE HEARINGS.

Appendix I

Appendix I

1987 SCHOOL BUDGET BALLOTING BY SCHOOL
HELD: MARCH 10 & 12, 1987

DIST	SCHOOL NAME	BOARD FIGURES: APPROVAL YES	APPROVAL NO	TOTAL VOTING YES	TOTAL VOTING NO	PARENTS YES	PARENTS NO	RESIDENTS YES	RESIDENTS NO	TEACHERS YES	TEACHERS NO	OTHER YES	OTHER NO	NON-VOTING	CORRECTED TOTALS: TOTAL VOTING YES	TOTAL VOTING NO	TOTAL ATTENDANCE
1	BATEMAN	APPROVED		11	10	7	10	0	0	3	0	1	0	1	11	10	22
1	BEARD	APPROVED		2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3
1	BEAUBIAN	APPROVED		10	1	9	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	10	1	13
1	BELDING	APPROVED		3	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	5
1	BRIDGE	APPROVED		7	0	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	7	0	8
1	BUDLONG	APPROVED		29	1	6	0	6	0	17	0	0	1	1	29	1	31
1	CANTY	APPROVED		12	2	5	2	1	0	3	0	3	0	1	12	2	15
1	CLEVELAND	APPROVED		5	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	5	0	6
1	DIRKSEN	APPROVED		12	1	11	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	12	1	15
1	DURSO	APPROVED		11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	1	10	0	11
1	ESINGER	APPROVED		7	0	5	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	7	0	8
1	EDGEBROOK	APPROVED		4	3*	4	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	2*	4	3	9
1	EDISON GIFTED	APPROVED		3	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
1	FARNSWORTH	APPROVED		33	0	8	0	4	0	21	0	0	0	1	33	0	34
1	GARVY	DISAPPROVED*		0	5	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	5	6
1	HAUGAN	APPROVED		11	1	8	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	10	1	11
1	HENRY	APPROVED		11	0	6	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	7	4	12
1	HIBBARD	APPROVED		26	3	8	3	4	0	14	0	0	0	4	26	3	33
1	HITCH	APPROVED		7	0	5	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	3	7	0	10
1	MURPHY	APPROVED		7	0	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	7	0	8
1	NORWOOD PARK	APPROVED		12	0	5	0	0	0	6	0	1	0	2	12	0	14
1	ONAHAN	APPROVED		5	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	5	0	6
1	ORIOLE PARK	APPROVED		8	0	6	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	8	0	10
1	PALMER	APPROVED		17	7	13	7	0	0	3	0	1	0	1	17	7	25
1	PETERSON	APPROVED		11	0	4	0	1	0	6	0	0	0	1	11	0	12
1	PORTAGE PARK	APPROVED		16	0	7	0	1	0	8	0	0	0	4	16	0	20
1	PRUSSING	APPROVED		13	6	10	5	1	0	2	1	0	0	3	13	6	22
1	SAUGANASH	APPROVED		6	0	1	0	0	0	4	0	1	0	1	6	0	7
1	SMYSER	APPROVED		8	0	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	9
1	SOLOMON	APPROVED		10	0	8	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	10	0	11
1	STOCK	APPROVED		8	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	8	0	11
1	THORP SCHL. ACADEMY	APPROVED		9	3	7	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	9	3	13
1	VOLTA	APPROVED		3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	4
1	VON STUBEEN UPPER	APPROVED		4	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	0	5
1	WATERS	APPROVED		12	0	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	12	0	15
1	WILDWOOD	APPROVED		2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3
DISTRICT 1 TOTALS:		35	1	355	46	202	44	20	0	106	3	21	2	53*	349	48	450
2	ARAI MIDDLE	APPROVED		18	1	7	1	1	0	9	0	1	0	6	18	1	25
2	ARMSTRONG	APPROVED		40	2	9	2	3	0	27	0	1	0	1	40	2	43
2	BOONE	APPROVED		38	0	5	0	4	0	25	0	4	0	1	38	0	39
2	BRENNEMANN	APPROVED		19	0	16	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	4	19	0	23
2	CHAPPELL	APPROVED		15	0	4	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	2	15	0	17

Appendix I

			BOARD FIGURES												CORRECTED TOTALS			
			APPROVAL		TOTAL VOTING		PARENTS		RESIDENTS		TEACHERS		OTHER			TOTAL VOTING		TOTAL ATTENDANCE
DIST		SCHOOL NAME	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	NON VOTING	YES	NO	
2		CLINTON	APPROVED		8	2	6	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	8	2	11
2		DECATUR CLASSICAL	APPROVED		19	0	9	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	1	19	0	20
2		DISNEY MAGNET	APPROVED		24	0	9	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	1	24	0	25
2		FIELD	APPROVED		41	2	13	1	2	0	26	1	0	0	10	41	2	53
2		GALE COMM. ACADEMY	APPROVED		4	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	2	4	0	6
2		GOUDY	APPROVED		11	0	2	0	3	0	5	0	1	0	1	11	0	12
2		MARTI BIL ED CTR BR																
2		GREELEY	APPROVED		12	0	4	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	3	12	0	15
2		HAIT	APPROVED		25	0	6	0	3	0	11	0	5	0	1	25	0	26
2		JAMIESON	APPROVED		13	0	8	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	1	13	0	14
2		KILMER	APPROVED		19	0	14	0	1	0	3	0	1	0	1	19	0	20
2		MCCUTCHEON	APPROVED		14	1	6	1	1	0	5	0	2	0	3	14	1	18
2		MCCUTCHEON BRANCH																
2		MCPHERSON	APPROVED		24	0	2	0	1	0	19	0	2	0	1	24	0	25
2		PEIRCE	APPROVED		29	0	8	0	8	0	13	0	0	0	1	29	0	30
2		ROGERS	APPROVED		23	0	13	0	2	0	8	0	0	0	1	23	0	24
2		STEWART	APPROVED		103	0	58	0	6	0	24	0	15	0	1	103	0	104
2		STEWART SALV ARMY																
2		STOCKTON	APPROVED		48	0	9	0	10	0	29	0	0	0	13	48	0	61
2		STOCKTON CPC																
2		STONE SCHLASTIC ACD	APPROVED		8	0	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	8	0	11
2		SWIFT	APPROVED		27	0	4	0	6	0	17	0	0	0	1	27	0	28
2		TRUMBULL	APPROVED		34	1	8	0	0	0	27	0	0	0	2	35	0	37
DISTRICT 2 TOTALS			24	0	616	9	228	7	51	0	306	1	32	0	62	617	8	687
3		AGASSIZ	APPROVED		23	0	8	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	4	23	0	27
3		ALCOTT	APPROVED		16	0	4	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	16	0	16
3		AUDUBON	APPROVED		3	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	0	5
3		BELL	APPROVED		14	0	5	0	0	0	5	0	4	0	0	14	0	14
3		BLAINE	APPROVED		21	2	13	2	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	21	2	23
3		BURLEY	DISAPPROVED		5	8	2	3	0	3	3	2	0	0	3	5	8	16
3		BYRD	APPROVED		10	0	8	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	10	0	10
3		COOLEY	APPROVED		13	0	6	0	1	0	6	0	0	0	0	13	0	13
3		COURTENAY SP ED	APPROVED		3	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	0	4
3		FERGUSON CPC																
3		FRANKLIN MAGNET	DISAPPROVED		8	13	0	13	0	0	8	0	2	0	2	10	13	25
3		HAMILTON	APPROVED		30	0	14	0	1	0	15	0	0	0	4	30	0	34
3		HAWTHORNE SCHOL ACDM	APPROVED		50	3	31	3	1	0	18	0	0	0	1	50	3	54
3		INTER-AMERICAN MAGNT	APPROVED		10	0	8	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	10	0	11
3		JENNER	APPROVED		11	0	8	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	11	0	12
3		LASALLE LANG ACADEMY	APPROVED		13	0	10	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	12	1	15
3		LEMOYNE	APPROVED		17	0	5	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	2	17	0	19
3		LINCOLN	APPROVED		47	0	26	0	0	0	21	0	0	0	4	47	0	51
3		LINCOLN PK HS BR																
3		MANIERRE	APPROVED		13	0	8	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	13	0	13
3		MAYER	APPROVED		7	0	3	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	2	7	0	9

Appendix I

			BOARD FIGURES												CORRECTED TOTALS			
		APPROVAL		TOTAL VOTING		PARENTS		RESIDENTS		TEACHERS		OTHER			TOTAL VOTING		TOTAL ATTENDANCE
DIST	SCHOOL NAME	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	NON VOTING	YES	NO	
3	MULLIGAN	APPROVED		7	0	2	0	0	0	5	0	2	0	2	9	0	11
3	NEITLEHORST	APPROVED		8	0	2	1	0	0	5	0	0	0	1	7	1	9
3	NEWBERRY MAGNET	APPROVED		19	0	4	1	0	0	14	0	0	0	2	18	1	21
3	OGDEN	APPROVED		6	0	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	0	8
3	RAVENSWOOD	APPROVED		3	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	0	5
3	SCHILLER	APPROVED		8	0	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	6	8	0	14
3	TRUTH PRIMARY	APPROVED		4	0	3	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	4	1	7
3	TRUTH CPC																
DISTRICT 3 TOTALS:		24	2	369	26	185	24	11	4	166	2	8	0	46	370	30	446
4	BARRY	APPROVED		26	0	11	0	1	0	14	0	0	0	2	26	0	28
4	BURBANK	APPROVED		13	0	10	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	1	13	0	14
4	BYFORD	APPROVED		9	0	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	0	10
4	DEVER	APPROVED		14	0	8	0	1	0	4	0	1	0	2	14	0	16
4	FALCONER	APPROVED		21	0	9	0	2	0	8	0	2	0	1	21	0	22
4	GRAY	APPROVED		7	0	5	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	0	9
4	HANSON PARK	APPROVED		22	0	7	0	0	0	10	0	5	0	2	22	0	24
4	HAY COMMUNITY ACDMY	APPROVED		10	2	8	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	10	2	14
4	HAY BRANCH																
4	HOKE	APPROVED		25	2	8	2	2	0	12	0	3	0	2	25	2	29
4	IRVING PARK	APPROVED		7	0	2	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	5	7	0	12
4	LEWIS	APPROVED		5	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	5	0	6
4	LLOYD	APPROVED		11	0	7	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	1	11	0	12
4	LOCKE	APPROVED		9	2	8	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	9	2	13
4	LOVETT	APPROVED		14	0	4	0	0	0	8	0	2	0	2	14	0	16
4	LYON	APPROVED		10	0	6	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	2	10	0	12
4	REINBERG	APPROVED		6	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	6	0	8
4	SAYRE LANGUAGE ACDMY	APPROVED		22	0	16	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	2	22	0	24
4	SCAMMON	APPROVED		12	0	6	0	1	0	4	0	1	0	2	12	0	14
4	SCHUBERT	DISAPPROVED		20	22	14	20	1	1	5	1	0	0	8	20	22	50
4	YOUNG	APPROVED		5	3	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	10
DISTRICT 4 TOTALS:		19	1	268	31	149	28	12	2	88	1	19	0	44*	268	31	343
5	AVONDALE	APPROVED		30	2	15	0	2	0	12	0	1	0	1	30	0	31
5	BRENTANO	APPROVED		18	1	5	1	0	0	13	0	0	0	1	18	1	20
5	CAMERON	APPROVED		0	0									4	0	0	4
5	DARWIN	APPROVED		15	1	12	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	1	15	1	17
5	FUNSTON	DISAPPROVED*		6	8	4	1	1	2	1	5	0	0	0	6	8	14
5	GOETHE	DISAPPROVED		0	15	0	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	15	19
5	JAHN	APPROVED		8	0	5	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	2	8	0	10
5	LINNE	APPROVED		9	1	6	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	9	1	11
5	LOWELL	APPROVED		23	0	17	0	0	0	4	0	2	0	3	23	0	26
5	MONROE	DISAPPROVED		0	8	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	8	10
5	MORSE	APPROVED		26	1	18	1	0	0	5	0	3	0	1	26	1	28

Appendix I

			BOARD FIGURES												CORRECTED TOTALS		
			APPROVAL		TOTAL VOTING		PARENTS		RESIDENTS		TEACHERS		OTHER			TOTAL VOTING		TOTAL ATTENDANCE
DIST	SCHOOL NAME		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	NON VOTING	YES	NO	
5	MORTON UPPER CYCLE		APPROVED		4	1	1	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	1	4	1	6
5	MORTON EVOC																	
5	MOZART		APPROVED		14	3	10	3	0	0	4	0	0	0	2	14	3	19
5	NIXON		APPROVED		20	0	7	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	20	0	20
5	NOBEL		APPROVED		18	0	11	0	0	0	5	0	2	0	2	18	0	20
5	ORR HEADSTART																	
5	PICCOLO ELEMENTARY		APPROVED		20	2	15	2	0	0	5	0	0	0	4	20	2	26
5	PICCOLO MIDDLE																	
5	PRESCOTT		APPROVED		8	6	5	5	0	0	3	0	0	1	2	8	6	16
5	PULASKI		APPROVED		45	3	38	2	0	1	7	0	0	0	4	45	3	52
5	REILLY		APPROVED		15	0	12	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	15	0	16
5	RIERSON		DISAPPROVED		0	12	0	9	0	2	0	1	0	0	6	0	12	18
5	SCHNEIDER		APPROVED		9	0	2	0	1	0	6	0	0	0	2	9	0	11
5	STOWE		DISAPPROVED		0	20	0	16	0	0	0	2	0	2	2	0	20	22
5	WARD		APPROVED		16	1	5	1	0	0	9	0	2	0	1	16	1	18
5	WRIGHT		APPROVED		7	1	5	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	7	1	9
DISTRICT 5 TOTALS:			19	5	311	86	193	65	5	7	103	9	10	3	48	311	84	443
-CAMERON'S BUDGET WAS APPROVED WITH A 0-0 VOTE, AND FOUR NON-VOTING PARTICIPANTS.																		
6	ANDERSEN		APPROVED		17	1	14	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	1	17	1	19
6	ANDERSEN EVOC		APPROVED		6	1	3	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	6	1	7
6	BURR		APPROVED		18	0	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	0	20
6	CARPENTER		APPROVED		5	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	1	5	0	6
6	CHASE		APPROVED		13	0	11	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	0	15
6	CHOPIN		DISAPPROVED		16	17	14	10	1	2	0	4	1	1	2	16	17	35
6	COLUMBUS		APPROVED		13	1	13	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	1	15
6	DIEGO COMMUNITY ACDM		DISAPPROVED		0	7	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	7	9
6	DRUMMOND		APPROVED		2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3
6	KOSCIUSZKO		APPROVED		51	8	44	6	0	0	6	0	1	2	19	51	8	78
6	LAFAYETTE		APPROVED		1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3
6	MITCHELL		APPROVED		13	0	8	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	2	13	0	15
6	MOOS		APPROVED		9	1	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	1	12
6	NEAR NORTH SPEC ED		APPROVED		1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3
6	OTIS		APPROVED		3	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	0	4
6	PEABODY		APPROVED		7	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	0	9
6	PRITZKER		DISAPPROVED		0	14	0	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	14	16
6	SABIN MAGNET		DISAPPROVED		0	133	0	114	0	5	0	8	0	6	4	0	133	137
6	TALCOTT		APPROVED		13	1	7	0	0	1	5	0	1	0	5	13	1	19
6	VON HUMBOLDT		APPROVED			0	5	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	7	0	9
6	VON HUMBOLDT CPC						0											
6	YATES		APPROVED		7	0	2	0	2	0	1	0	2	0	0	7	0	7
DISTRICT 6 TOTALS:			17	4	195	184	161	152	7	8	26	13	8	11	55	202	184	441

Appendix I

			BOARD FIGURES											CORRECTED TOTALS		
		APPROVAL	TOTAL VOTING		PARENTS		RESIDENTS		TEACHERS		OTHER			TOTAL VOTING		TOTAL ATTENDANCE
DIST	SCHOOL NAME	YES / NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	NON VOTING	YES	NO	
7	ARMSTRONG BRANCH															
7	BEIDLER	APPROVED	7	0	3	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	1	7	0	8
7	CLARK MIDDLE	DISAPPROVED	9	2	1	2	0	2	1	2	0	0	3	2	6	11
7	COLE CPC															
7	DELANO	APPROVED	18	5	6	3	3	1	6	1	3	0	1	18	5	24
7	DELANO CPC															
7	DEPRIEST	APPROVED	8	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	4	0	2	8	0	10
7	DOUGLASS MIDDLE	APPROVED	8	2	3	2	0	0	2	0	3	0	3	8	2	13
7	ELLINGTON	APPROVED	6	2	2	1	2	0	1	1	1	0	1	6	2	9
7	ELLINGTON BRANCH															
7	EMMET	APPROVED	42	4	17	1	0	0	25	3	0	0	2	42	4	48
7	ERICSON	APPROVED	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
7	GOLDBLATT	APPROVED	7	0	5	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	7	0	9
7	HEFFERAN	APPROVED	9	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	0	10
7	KEY	APPROVED	32	0	17	0	2	0	13	0	0	0	2	32	0	34
7	CLARK BRANCH-KEY															
7	MARCONI	APPROVED	24	0	17	0	1	0	5	0	1	0	2	24	0	26
7	MAY	APPROVED	5	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	2	5	0	7
7	MELODY	APPROVED	13	0	7	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	3	13	0	16
7	NASH	APPROVED	7	1	6	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	9	1	12
7	ROENTGEN EVGC	APPROVED	7	0	3	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	3	7	0	10
7	SPENCER	APPROVED	3	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	2	5	0	7
7	TILTON	APPROVED	24	0	8	0	3	0	11	0	2	0	3	24	0	27
7	WESTINGHOUSE HISTART															
DISTRICT 7 TOTALS:		18 / 1	241	16	113	10	19	3	81	7	25	0	37	238	20	295
8	BETHUNE	APPROVED	16	3	12	2	0	0	2	0	2	1	2	16	3	21
8	BURROUGHS	APPROVED	11	3	6	3	0	0	4	0	1	0	2	11	3	16
8	CHALMERS	APPROVED	6	0	2	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	2	6	0	8
8	COOK COUNTY DEIN CTR															
8	BARTELME BRANCH															
8	THE CENTER BRANCH															
8	HARTGROVE HOSP ER															
8	COOPER PRIM/INTER	APPROVED	25	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	3	25	0	28
8	COOPER UPPER CYCLE	APPROVED	15	0	8	0	1	0	6	0	0	0	1	15	0	16
8	DAVIS	APPROVED	39	0	15	0	2	0	22	0	0	0	0	39	0	39
8	EVERETT	APPROVED	11	0	7	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	11	0	11
8	GONSALUS SCHOL ACDM	APPROVED	21	0	7	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	1	21	0	22
8	HAMMOND	APPROVED	14	1	12	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	14	1	15
8	HEDGES	APPROVED	4	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	6
8	HEDGES EAST															
8	HEDGES WEST															
8	HOWLAND	APPROVED	30	1	14	0	2	0	13	0	1	1	0	30	1	31
8	JOHNSON	APPROVED	15	0	6	0	3	0	6	0	0	0	3	15	0	18

Appendix I

			BOARD FIGURES												CORRECTED TOTALS			
			APPROVAL	TOTAL VOTING		PARENTS		RESIDENTS		TEACHERS		OTHER			TOTAL VOTING		TOTAL ATTENDANCE
DIST		SCHOOL NAME	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	NON VOTING	YES	NO	
8		JUNGMAN BRANCH																
8		KOMENSKY	APPROVED		3	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
8		LATHROP	APPROVED		19	1	11	1	2	0	4	0	2	0	0	19	1	20
8		PICKARD	APPROVED		10	2	5	2	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	10	2	12
8		PILSEN COMM ACADEMY	APPROVED		44	1	21	1	1	0	21	0	1	0	0	44	1	45
8		SALAZAR BILING CTR	DISAPPROVED		10	15	7	15	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	10	15	26
8		PLAMONDON	APPROVED		36	1	33	1	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	36	1	37
8		POPE	APPROVED		7	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	7	0	7
8		SAUCEDO MAGNET	APPROVED		19	1	8	0	5	1	5	0	1	0	0	19	1	20
8		SHIELDS	APPROVED		6	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	0	6
8		SPRY	APPROVED		27	0	3	0	5	0	19	0	0	0	0	27	0	27
8		WALSH	APPROVED		4	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4
8		WHITTIER	APPROVED		12	0	9	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	2	12	0	14
8		WHITTIER BRANCH																
DISTRICT 8 TOTALS:			24	1	408	29	227	26	25	1	137	0	19	2	19	408	29	456
9		BROWN	APPROVED		24	0	18	0	0	0	1	0	5	0	2	24	0	26
9		CALHOUN NORTH	APPROVED		10	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	10	1	13
9		CAMER	APPROVED		8	6	3	5	0	0	3	1	2	0	3	8	6	17
9		DETT	APPROVED		8	0	2	0	0	0	4	0	2	0	2	8	0	10
9		DICKENS CPC																
9		DODGE	APPROVED		16	0	7	0	1	0	6	0	2	0	4	16	0	20
9		FARADAY	APPROVED		16	0	5	0	0	0	9	0	2	0	1	16	0	17
9		GLADSTONE	APPROVED		24	1	18	1	2	0	4	0	0	0	2	24	1	27
9		GRANT	APPROVED		43	1	19	1	0	0	22	0	2	0	3	43	1	47
9		HERBERT	APPROVED		23	1	9	0	0	1	13	0	1	0	1	23	1	25
9		IRVING	APPROVED		39	0	11	0	2	0	15	0	11	0	2	39	0	41
9		JACKSON ADULT CTR	APPROVED		7	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	2	0	0	7	0	7
9		EL CENTRO DELA CAUSA																
9		JACKSON LANG ACADEMY	DISAPPROVED		3	7	0	6	0	0	3	1	0	0	2	3	7	12
9		JEFFERSON	APPROVED		14	3	4	3	0	0	8	0	2	0	3	14	3	20
9		JENSEN SCHOL ACADEMY	APPROVED		13	0	9	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	1	13	0	14
9		JOINER CPC																
9		KING ELEMENTARY	APPROVED		20	0	12	0	2	0	6	0	0	0	7	20	0	27
9		MEDILL PRIMARY	APPROVED		13	0	8	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	5	13	0	18
9		MEDILL INTER/UPPER	APPROVED		41	1	12	1	6	0	19	0	4	0	2	41	1	44
9		MCKINLEY EVCC BR	APPROVED		14	0	1	0	2	0	9	0	2	0	1	14	0	15
9		MILLER CPC																
9		MONTEFIORE	APPROVED		48	0	5	0	0	0	33	0	10	0	2	48	0	50
9		REIS	APPROVED		13	2	6	1	1	0	6	0	0	1	2	13	2	17
9		SKINNER CLASSICAL	APPROVED		11	2	9	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	3	11	2	16
9		SMYTH	APPROVED		34	4	17	4	0	0	17	0	0	0	4	34	4	42
9		SPALDING PRYS HAND																
9		SPALDING ELEM BR																
9		SUDER	APPROVED		22	1	19	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	2	22	1	25
9		YOUNG PREP																

Appendix I

DIST	SCHOOL NAME	BOARD FIGURES: APPROVAL	BOARD FIGURES: TOTAL VOTING YES	BOARD FIGURES: TOTAL VOTING NO	PARENTS YES	PARENTS NO	RESIDENTS YES	RESIDENTS NO	TEACHERS YES	TEACHERS NO	OTHER YES	OTHER NO	NON VOTING	CORRECTED TOTALS: TOTAL VOTING YES	CORRECTED TOTALS: TOTAL VOTING NO	CORRECTED TOTALS: TOTAL ATTENDANCE
	DISTRICT 9 TOTALS:	22 / 1	464	30	203	25	18	1	192	2	51	2	56	464	30	950
10	BURNS	APPROVED	37	35	4	27	2	4	26	0	8	4	3	40	35	78
10	CARDENAS	APPROVED	28	0	8	0	1	0	19	0	0	0	1	28	0	29
10	CORKERY	DISAPPROVED	28	74	6	62	2	12	19	0	1	0	0	28	74	102
10	CROWN COMM ACADEMY	APPROVED	16	0	8	0	1	0	10	0	0	0	3	19	0	22
10	DVORAK	APPROVED	15	0	5	0	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	10	0	10
10	FRAZIER	APPROVED	15	0	6	0	0	0	7	0	2	0	1	15	0	16
10	GARY	APPROVED	49	0	11	0	1	0	37	0	0	0	6	49	0	55
10	GREGORY	APPROVED	24	0	13	0	1	0	5	0	5	0	0	24	0	24
10	HANSBERRY CPC															
10	HENSON	APPROVED	13	0	4	0	1	0	5	0	3	0	0	13	0	13
10	HERZL	APPROVED	27	1	19	1	0	0	7	0	1	0	0	27	1	28
10	HERZL CPC															
10	HUGHES	APPROVED	10	0	5	0	0	0	2	0	3	0	0	10	0	10
10	JUNCON MAGNET	APPROVED	69	2	40	2	0	0	27	0	2	0	5	69	2	76
10	LAWNDALE COMM ACDMY	APPROVED	9	1	5	1	0	0	3	0	1	0	1	9	1	11
10	MASON	APPROVED	14	2	8	1	0	0	3	0	3	1	5	14	2	21
10	MASON CPC															
10	MCCORMICK	APPROVED	39	25	9	25	5	0	27	0	0	0	2	41	25	68
10	MCCORMICK BRANCH															
10	OLIVE CPC															
10	PADEREWSKI	APPROVED	10	0	3	0	2	0	3	0	2	0	0	10	0	10
10	PENN	APPROVED	4	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	4	0	6
10	SUMNER	APPROVED	9	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	9	0	9
10	WEBSTER	APPROVED	12	2	8	1	0	0	3	0	3	1	2	14	2	18
10	WHITNEY	DISAPPROVED	9	85	8	71	1	3	0	7	0	4	4	9	85	98
	DISTRICT 10 TOTALS:	18 / 2	437	227	179	191	17	19	208	7	38	10	35	442	227	704
11	ABBOTT	APPROVED	16	0	2	0	0	0	10	0	4	0	0	16	0	16
11	ARMOUR															
11	ATTUCKS	APPROVED	26	11	6	4	3	7	14	0	3	0	1	26	11	38
11	DONOGHUE	APPROVED	23	0	13	0	0	0	7	0	3	0	0	23	0	23
11	DONOGHUE CPC															
11	DOOLITTLE PRIMARY	APPROVED	7	0	4	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	7	0	7
11	DOOLITTLE INTER/UPPE	APPROVED	6	0	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	6	0	6
11	DOUGLAS COMM ACDMY	APPROVED	10	1	5	1	1	0	2	0	2	0	0	10	1	11
11	DRAKE	APPROVED	8	0	5	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	8	0	8
11	DRAKE EVGC															
11	EINSTEIN	APPROVED	20	0	10	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	20	0	20
11	GREENE	APPROVED	3	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	0	4
11	HAINES	APPROVED	27	0	11	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	27	0	27
11	HAINES BRANCH															
11	HEALY	APPROVED	8	0	4	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	13	8	0	21

Appendix I

		BOARD FIGURES													CORRECTED TOTALS			
		APPROVAL		TOTAL VOTING		PARENTS		RESIDENTS		TEACHERS		OTHER			TOTAL VOTING		TOTAL ATTENDANCE
DIST	SCHOOL NAME	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	NON VOTING	YES	NO	
11	HOLDEN	APPROVED		13	0	9	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	8	13	0	21
11	MAYO	APPROVED		17	0	8	0	3	0	4	0	2	0	4	17	0	21
11	MCCLELLAN	APPROVED		5	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	16	5	0	21
11	PERSHING MAGNET	APPROVED		8	1	5	1	0	0	1	0	2	0	12	8	1	21
11	RAYMOND	APPROVED		12	0	4	0	1	0	3	0	4	0	9	12	0	21
11	SHERIDAN MAGNET	APPROVED		13	0	8	0	0	0	4	0	1	0	8	13	0	21
11	WARD	APPROVED		13	0	8	0	0	0	3	0	2	0	8	13	0	21
11	DEARBORN PARK BR																
11	WILLIAMS	APPROVED		10	0	6	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	11	10	0	21
DISTRICT 11 TOTALS:		19	0	245	13	115	6	10	7	92	0	28	0	91*	245	13	349
12	BLAIR SPECIAL ED	APPROVED		7	0	2	0	0	0	3	0	2	0	0	7	0	7
12	BONTEMPS	APPROVED		35	0	23	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	0	35
12	BYRNE	APPROVED		6	1	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	1	9
12	CHRISTOPHER PHIS HAN	APPROVED		16	1	5	1	0	0	10	0	1	0	0	16	1	17
12	COPERNICUS	APPROVED		8	0	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	8	0	8
12	DORE	APPROVED		1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
12	EDWARDS	APPROVED		5	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	5	0	7
12	FULTON	APPROVED		6	0	4	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	0	6
12	FULTON BRANCH																
12	GRIMES	APPROVED		17	0	4	0	2	0	11	0	0	0	3	17	0	20
12	FLEMING BRANCH	APPROVED		10	0	1	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	3	10	0	13
12	HALE	APPROVED		5	0	2	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	5	0	5
12	HEARST	APPROVED		32	8	12	7	3	0	17	1	0	0	0	32	8	40
12	HENDERSON	APPROVED		8	2	6	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	8	2	10
12	HOLMES	APPROVED		9	0	6	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	0	10
12	KENZIE	APPROVED		9	0	6	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	9	0	9
12	LIBBY	DISAPPROVED*		10	11	10	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	10	11	21
12	NIGHTINGALE	APPROVED		27	0	11	0	1	0	14	0	1	0	1	27	0	28
12	PASTEUR	DISAPPROVED*		2	2	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	2	2	6
12	PECK	APPROVED		4	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	2	4	0	6
12	SAWYER	APPROVED		8	0	5	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	2	8	0	10
12	SHERMAN	APPROVED		10	0	4	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	10	0	10
12	TONTI	APPROVED		6	5	4	3	0	0	2	1	0	1	2	6	5	13
12	TWAIN	DISAPPROVED		5	20	0	19	0	1	5	0	0	0	1	5	20	26
DISTRICT 12 TOTALS:		20	3	246	50	121	44	24	1	96	3	5	2	22	246	50	318
*-PASTEUR'S BUDGET WAS DISAPPROVED DUE TO A TIE VOTE.																	
13	BEALE	APPROVED		22	0	5	0	1	0	8	0	8	0	3	22	0	25
13	BEASLEY ACADEMIC CTR	APPROVED		24	0	16	0	1	0	3	0	4	0	0	24	0	24
13	BEETHOVEN	APPROVED		15	0	7	0	3	0	3	0	2	0	3	15	0	18
13	BURKE	APPROVED		13	0	6	0	2	0	5	0	0	0	0	13	0	13
13	CARTER	APPROVED		5	0	2	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	5	0	8
13	COCKRELL CPC																

Appendix I

		BOARD FIGURES													CORRECTED TOTALS		
		APPROVAL		TOTAL VOTING		PARENTS		RESIDENTS		TEACHERS		OTHER			TOTAL VOTING		TOTAL ATTENDANCE
DIST	SCHOOL NAME	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	NON VOTING	YES	NO	
13	COLEMAN	APPROVED		3	2	1	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	3	2	5
13	DEWEY	APPROVED		4	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	4
13	DEWEY CPC																
13	DYETT MIDDLE	APPROVED		35	0	12	0	2	0	13	0	8	0	0	35	0	35
13	FARREN	APPROVED		21	1	17	1	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	21	1	22
13	FARREN CPC																
13	GRAHAM	APPROVED		11	0	4	0	2	0	3	0	2	0	0	11	0	11
13	HAMLINE	APPROVED		14	0	9	0	0	0	3	0	2	0	0	14	0	14
13	HARTIGAN	APPROVED		27	0	15	0	1	0	6	0	5	0	0	27	0	27
13	HENDRICKS	APPROVED		7	1	5	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	7	1	8
13	HOPE COMMUNITY ACDMY	APPROVED		9	0	2	0	3	0	2	0	2	0	0	9	0	9
13	MCCORKLE	APPROVED		9	0	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	9	0	9
13	OVERTON	APPROVED		9	0	6	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	1	9	0	10
13	OVERTON CPC																
13	PARKMAN	APPROVED		5	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	0	6
13	ROSS	APPROVED		17	1	7	1	0	0	8	0	2	0	2	17	1	20
13	SEWARD	APPROVED		30	0	23	0	2	0	5	0	0	0	1	30	0	31
13	SHERWOOD	APPROVED		8	1	6	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	8	1	9
13	TERRELL	APPROVED		5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	5	0	5
	DISTRICT 13 TOTALS:	21	0	293	6	157	5	19	0	73	1	44	0	14*	293	6	313
14	CARNEGIE	APPROVED		15	0	11	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	3	15	0	18
14	DILLES	APPROVED		5	0	2	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	2	5	0	7
14	DUMAS	APPROVED		15	0	8	0	2	0	5	0	0	0	3	15	0	18
14	DUMAS CPC																
14	FERMI	APPROVED		6	1	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	6	1	10
14	FISKE	APPROVED		9	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	0	12
14	FULLER	APPROVED		10	0	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	10	0	11
14	HARTE	APPROVED		1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
14	KOZMINSKI COMM ACDMY	APPROVED		8	0	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	8	0	10
14	MCCOSH	APPROVED		13	0	9	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	2	13	0	15
14	MCLLISON	APPROVED		17	0	8	0	1	0	8	0	0	0	3	17	0	20
14	MURRAY LANG ACADEMY	APPROVED		3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	5
14	OAKENWALD NORTH CPC																
14	PRICE	APPROVED		9	2	4	1	0	1	5	0	0	0	3	9	2	14
14	RAY	APPROVED		16	1	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	16	1	21
14	REAVIS	APPROVED		2	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	4
14	ROBINSON RA-OAKENWLD	APPROVED		6	0	3	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	4	6	0	10
14	SEXTON	DISAPPROVED		4	5	4	3	0	1	0	1	0	0	8	4	5	17
14	SHAKESPEARE	APPROVED		12	2	7	2	0	0	3	0	2	0	2	12	2	16
14	SHOESMITH	APPROVED		11	2	8	2	1	0	2	0	0	0	2	11	2	15
14	WADSWORTH	APPROVED		13	0	8	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	4	13	0	17
14	WADSWORTH CPC																
14	WIRTH EXPERIMENTAL	DISAPPROVED		3	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
14	WOODSON NORTH	APPROVED		8	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	10
14	WOODSON SOUTH	APPROVED		10	0	5	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	1	10	0	11

Appendix I

		BOARD FIGURES													CORRECTED TOTALS			
		APPROVAL		TOTAL VOTING		PARENTS		RESIDENTS		TEACHERS		OTHER			TOTAL VOTING		TOTAL ATTENDANCE
DIST	SCHOOL NAME	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	NON VOTING	YES	NO	
14	WOODSON CPC																
DISTRICT 14 TOTALS:		20	2	196	15	134	11	7	2	45	1	7	0	58*	193	14	265
15	ALTGELD	APPROVED		18	0	11	0	2	0	1	0	4	0	0	18	0	18
15	BAPTON	APPROVED		7	0	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	7	0	9
15	BUNCHE	APPROVED		9	0	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	9	0	11
15	CARROLL	APPROVED		8	1	3	1	0	0	2	0	3	0	0	8	1	9
15	ROSENWALD BRANCH																
15	DAVIS	APPROVED		9	1	4	0	2	0	2	1	1	0	0	9	1	10
15	EARLE	APPROVED		6	0	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	6
15	EBERHART	APPROVED		17	1	5	1	2	0	10	0	0	0	4	17	1	22
15	FOSTER PARK	APPROVED		6	3	2	2	0	1	3	0	1	0	0	6	3	9
15	GOODLOW MAGNET	APPROVED		11	0	5	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	11	0	11
15	HURLEY	APPROVED		11	0	5	0	2	0	4	0	0	0	1	11	0	12
15	JOPLIN	APPROVED		19	3	7	0	2	0	9	3	1	0	0	19	3	22
15	LEE	DISAPPROVED		4	5	1	5	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	4	5	12
15	MARQUETTE	APPROVED		32	4	8	4	0	0	21	0	3	0	4	32	4	40
15	MCKAY	APPROVED		28	0	5	0	0	0	17	0	6	0	0	28	0	28
15	MORRILL	APPROVED		10	1	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	10	1	14
15	O'TOOLE	APPROVED		12	1	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	5	12	1	18
15	OWEN SCHOOL ACADEMY	APPROVED		32	0	20	0	3	0	7	0	2	0	0	32	0	32
15	RANDOLPH MAGNET	APPROVED		20	0	8	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	20	0	20
15	RASTER	APPROVED		12	0	7	0	0	0	4	0	1	0	2	12	0	14
15	RASTER BRANCH																
15	STEVENSON	APPROVED		15	0	6	0	0	0	7	0	2	0	1	15	0	16
DISTRICT 15 TOTALS:		19	1	286	20	138	13	19	1	104	6	25	0	27	286	20	333
16	BANNEKER	APPROVED		9	0	4	0	1	0	2	0	2	0	1	9	0	10
16	BASS	APPROVED		13	0	11	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	0	17
16	BOND	APPROVED		6	0	2	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	6	0	6
16	COOK	APPROVED		15	2	9	1	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	15	2	17
16	CUFFE	DISAPPROVED		3	6	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	6	12
16	GERSHWIN	APPROVED		26	0	21	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	2	26	0	28
16	GOETHALS EVOC	APPROVED		7	1	3	0	1	0	3	0	0	1	0	7	1	8
16	GUGGENHEIM	APPROVED		9	2	6	2	1	0	1	0	1	0	5	9	2	16
16	HARVARD	APPROVED		19	0	3	0	3	0	12	0	1	0	4	19	0	23
16	HILLIARD ADULT CTR	APPROVED		29	1	0	0	0	0	14	0	15	1	1	29	1	31
16	BROADWAY BRANCH																
16	HINTON	APPROVED		6	0	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	0	8
16	KERSHAW	APPROVED		16	0	12	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	3	16	0	19
16	OGLESBY	APPROVED		14	1	8	1	0	0	2	0	4	0	0	14	1	15
16	PARKER COMM ACADEMY	APPROVED		25	3	10	2	0	0	12	1	3	0	3	25	3	31
16	PARKER CPC																
16	PEED	APPROVED		20	0	6	0	0	0	6	0	8	0	0	20	0	20

Appendix I

DIST	SCHOOL NAME	BOARD FIGURES: APPROVAL		BOARD FIGURES: TOTAL VOTING		BOARD FIGURES: PARENTS		BOARD FIGURES: RESIDENTS		BOARD FIGURES: TEACHERS		BOARD FIGURES: OTHER		BOARD FIGURES: NON VOTING	CORRECTED TOTALS: TOTAL VOTING		CORRECTED TOTALS: TOTAL ATTENDANCE
		YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO		YES	NO	
16	STAGG	APPROVED		12	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	12	0	12
16	WENTWORTH	APPROVED		20	1	13	0	1	0	6	0	0	1	0	20	1	21
16	WESCOTT	APPROVED		16	1	7	1	0	0	6	0	3	0	1	16	1	18
16	YALE	APPROVED		7	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	7
DISTRICT 16 TOTALS:		18	1	272	18	139	12	11	1	81	1	41	4	29	272	18	319
17	AVALON PARK	APPROVED		4	2	3	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	6
17	BRADWELL	APPROVED		7	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	1	8
17	BROWNELL	APPROVED		17	1	6	1	1	0	5	0	5	0	0	17	1	18
17	BYRN MAWR	APPROVED		10	0	8	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	10	0	11
17	BYRN MAWR BRANCH																
17	CALDWELL	APPROVED		8	4	3	3	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	8	4	12
17	MCDOWELL BRANCH	DISAPPROVED*		2	2	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	2	2	4
17	COLES	APPROVED		55	1	35	1	1	0	18	0	1	0	6	55	1	62
17	DENEEN	APPROVED		2	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
17	DIXON	DISAPPROVED		1	18	0	14	0	2	0	1	1	1	0	1	18	19
17	MADISON	APPROVED		6	3	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	3	11
17	NASH	DISAPPROVED		0	14	0	10	0	2	0	2	0	0	3	0	14	17
17	NEIL	APPROVED		23	2	15	2	0	0	8	0	0	0	4	23	2	29
17	NEIL PRES HANDICAP																
17	DAVIS BRANCH																
17	NINOS HEINOS MACHETT	APPROVED		9	0	6	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	9	0	9
17	O'KEEFE	DISAPPROVED*		2	6	0	4	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	2	6	8
17	PARK MANOR	APPROVED		81	0	66	0	2	0	12	0	1	0	0	81	0	81
17	PARKSIDE COMM ACDMY	APPROVED		7	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	7	0	7
17	PIRIE	DISAPPROVED		3	9	1	6	0	0	0	3	2	0	1	3	9	13
17	POWELL	APPROVED		9	0	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	9	0	9
17	REVERE	APPROVED		12	1	6	1	1	0	4	0	1	0	3	12	1	16
17	RUGGLES	APPROVED		7	1	3	1	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	7	1	8
17	SEABOARD	APPROVED		8	0	4	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	1	8	0	9
17	SULLIVAN	APPROVED		22	0	19	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	22	0	22
17	TANNER	APPROVED		9	0	2	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	9	0	9
DISTRICT 17 TOTALS:		18	5	304	65	201	48	11	7	73	8	19	2	21	304	65	390
*MCDOWELL BRANCH OF CALDWELL'S BUDGET WAS DISAPPROVED DUE TO A TIE VOTE.																	
18	BARNARD	APPROVED		12	2	2	0	1	0	12	0	0	0	1	15	0	16
18	BRENAN	DISAPPROVED		9	4	0	6	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	2	9	11
18	CASSELL	APPROVED		10	0	5	2	0	0	6	0	0	0	3	11	2	16
18	CLISSOLD	APPROVED		17	1	12	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	17	1	18
18	EDMOND	APPROVED		10	0	3	0	1	0	6	0	0	0	0	10	0	10
18	EVERS	APPROVED		5	2	4	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	6	2	9
18	FERNWOOD	APPROVED		3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
18	FORT DEARBORN	DISAPPROVED		1	11	0	10	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	2	11	14
18	GARVEY	APPROVED		1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1

Appendix I

			BOARD FIGURES												CORRECTED TOTALS		
		APPROVAL	TOTAL VOTING		PARENTS		RESIDENTS		TEACHERS		OTHER				TOTAL VOTING		TOTAL ATTENDANCE
DIST	SCHOOL NAME	YES / NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	NON VOTING		YES	NO	
18	GREEN	APPROVED	6	1	3	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0		5	1	6
18	GRESHAM	APPROVED	13	3	1	0	3	1	10	2	0	0	1		14	3	18
18	HIGGINS COMM ACADEMY	APPROVED	13	11	5	5	0	0	4	3	0	0	0		13	11	24
18	JACKSON	APPROVED	5	1	1	1	2	0	2	0	0	0	0		5	1	6
18	KELLER MAGNET	APPROVED	15	0	13	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	1		16	0	17
18	KELLOG	APPROVED	17	0	14	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0		17	0	17
18	KIPLING	APPROVED	4	3	3	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	0		5	3	8
18	METCALFE	APPROVED	10	5	9	3	0	0	1	2	0	0	0		10	5	15
18	MORGAN	DISAPPROVED	0	13	0	4	0	6	0	3	0	0	0		0	13	13
18	MORGAN PARK PREP																
18	MOUNT GREENWOOD	APPROVED	10	0	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0		10	0	10
18	MOUNT VERNON	APPROVED	4	0	2	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0		4	1	5
18	NANSEN	APPROVED	21	0	19	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	1		22	0	23
18	RIDER	APPROVED	22	2	11	1	4	0	7	1	0	0	0		22	2	24
18	SHOOP	APPROVED	10	1	7	1	0	0	5	0	0	0	2		12	1	15
18	SUTHERLAND	APPROVED	12	1	7	0	0	1	7	0	0	0	2		14	1	17
16	TURNER-DREW LANG ACD	DISAPPROVED	1	10	1	8	0	0	2	0	0	0	0		3	8	11
18	VANDERPOEL MAGNET	APPROVED	2	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1		3	0	4
18	WACKER	APPROVED	12	4	10	3	0	0	2	1	0	0	0		12	4	16
18	WEST PULLMAN	APPROVED	9	2	4	0	2	0	5	0	0	0	0		11	0	11
18	WHITE BRANCH	APPROVED	9	0	6	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0		9	0	9
16	WHISTLER	APPROVED	5	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		3	0	3
DISTRICT 18 TOTALS:		26 / 4	268	77	163	54	16	10	98	15	0	0	14		277	79	370
19	ADAMS	DISAPPROVED	1	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	3		1	2	6
19	BENNETT	APPROVED	9	0	5	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	1		9	0	10
19	SHELD BRANCH																
19	BLACK MAGNET	APPROVED	14	1	10	1	2	0	2	0	0	0	2		14	1	17
19	BLACK MAGNET BRANCH																
19	BRIGHT	APPROVED	16	0	5	0	2	0	9	0	0	0	0		16	0	16
19	BUCKINGHAM	APPROVED	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0		4	0	4
19	BURNHAM	APPROVED	13	2	3	1	1	1	8	0	1	0	4		13	2	19
19	ANTHONY BRANCH																
19	GOLDSMITH BRANCH																
19	BURNSIDE SCHOL ACDMY	APPROVED	15	1	9	1	2	0	4	0	2	0	2		17	1	20
19	GALLISTEL LANG ACDMY	APPROVED	9	0	5	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	3		9	0	12
19	GILLESPIE PROVINTER	APPROVED	15	1	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	7		15	1	23
19	HOYNE	APPROVED	12	2	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1		13	2	16
19	EARHART BRANCH	APPROVED	6	0	1	0	2	0	4	0	0	0	3		7	0	10
19	LUELLA	APPROVED	7	0	3	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	2		9	0	11
19	MARSH	DISAPPROVED	0	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		0	5	6
19	MCDADE	APPROVED	5	1	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		5	1	8
19	PERRY	APPROVED	5	3	4	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	2		5	3	10
19	SCHMID	APPROVED	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		2	0	3
19	SHERIDAN	APPROVED	80	0	14	0	0	0	64	0	2	0	1		80	0	81
19	SMITH	APPROVED	3	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0		3	0	3

Appendix I

		BOARD FIGURES													CORRECTED TOTALS			
		APPROVAL		TOTAL VOTING		PARENTS		RESIDENTS		TEACHERS		OTHER			TOTAL VOTING		TOTAL ATTENDANCE
DIST	SCHOOL NAME	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	NON VOTING	YES	NO	
19	TAYLOR	APPROVED		14	1	13	1	0	0	1	0	3	0	3	17	1	21
19	THORP	APPROVED		56	1	22	1	1	0	29	0	3	0	1	55	1	57
19	THORP EVGC																
19	WARREN	APPROVED		9	0	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	10	0	11
DISTRICT 19 TOTALS:		19	2	295	20	139	16	11	2	139	1	15	1	40	304	20	361
20	ALDRIDGE	DISAPPROVED		0	14	0	6	0	0	0	5	0	3	2	0	14	16
20	CARVER PRIMARY	APPROVED		22	0	15	0	0	0	6	0	1	0	0	22	0	22
20	CARVER MIDDLE	APPROVED		4	8	4	0	0	5	0	3	0	0	2	4	8	14
20	CLAY	APPROVED		10	0	7	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	10	0	10
20	CULLEN	APPROVED		7	1	4	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	7	1	9
20	CURTIS	APPROVED		21	2	2	2	5	0	11	0	3	0	0	21	2	23
20	DUBOIS	APPROVED		18	0	4	0	0	0	13	0	1	0	1	18	0	19
20	DUNNE	APPROVED		16	0	7	0	4	0	5	0	0	0	0	16	0	16
20	COOPERS	APPROVED		29	1	2	0	0	0	22	0	5	1	0	29	1	30
20	GRISSOM	APPROVED		7	0	4	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	7	0	7
20	HUGHES	APPROVED		5	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	1	5	0	6
20	KOHN	APPROVED		8	0	1	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	3	8	0	11
20	OWENS COMM ACADEMY	APPROVED		3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	5
20	POE CLASSICAL	APPROVED		12	0	5	0	0	0	6	0	1	0	1	12	0	13
20	PULLMAN	APPROVED		26	0	15	0	1	0	7	0	3	0	1	26	0	27
20	SCANLAN	APPROVED		10	0	5	0	0	0	2	0	3	0	0	10	0	10
20	VAN VLISSINGEN	APPROVED		9	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	9	0	9
20	WASHINGTON	APPROVED		14	0	8	0	1	0	4	0	1	0	0	14	0	14
20	WHEATLEY CPC																
DISTRICT 20 TOTALS:		17	1	221	26	95	9	12	5	89	8	25	4	14	221	26	261
31	AMUNDSEN HIGH	APPROVED		10	0	3	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	7	10	0	17
31	ANDERSEN EVGC (9TH)	APPROVED		6	1	3	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	2	6	1	9
31	AUSTIN COMM. ACADEMY	APPROVED		26	2	8	0	1	2	16	0	1	0	1	26	2	29
31	CLEMENTE COMM. ACDMY	APPROVED		20	1	8	0	3	0	6	1	3	0	1	20	1	22
31	FLOWER VOC HIGH	APPROVED		8	0	1	0	5	0	2	0	0	0	2	8	0	10
31	FOREMAN HIGH	APPROVED		14	0	8	0	2	0	1	0	3	0	1	14	0	15
31	KELVYN PARK HIGH	APPROVED		25	0	14	0	1	0	6	0	4	0	3	25	0	28
31	LAKEVIEW HIGH	APPROVED		33	7	21	7	5	0	7	0	0	0	3	33	7	43
31	LANE TECH HIGH	APPROVED		12	0	1	0	0	0	4	0	7	0	2	12	0	14
31	LINCOLN PARK HIGH	APPROVED		12	0	1	0	0	0	4	0	7	0	2	12	0	14
31	LINCOLN PK JW BR.																
31	MATHER HIGH	APPROVED		37	1	9	0	0	0	28	1	0	0	1	37	1	39
31	MCCLAREN OCC HIGH	APPROVED		1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3
31	NEAR NO CAREER MAGNT	APPROVED		18	1	10	1	0	0	8	0	0	0	3	18	1	22
31	NORTHSIDE LEARN CTR	APPROVED		10	0	4	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	1	10	0	11
31	OWR COMM. ACADEMY	APPROVED		4	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	5

Appendix I

		BOARD FIGURES													CORRECTED TOTALS		
		APPROVAL		TOTAL VOTING		PARENTS		RESIDENTS		TEACHERS		OTHER			TOTAL VOTING		TOTAL ATTENDANCE
DIST	SCHOOL NAME	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	NON VOTING	YES	NO	
31	ROOSEVELT HIGH	APPROVED		19	0	14	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	3	19	0	22
31	SCHURZ HIGH	APPROVED		13	0	10	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	7	13	0	20
31	SENN METRO HIGH	APPROVED		29	3	9	1	6	1	13	1	1	0	8	29	3	40
31	INDIAN CENTER BR																
31	STEINMETZ HIGH	APPROVED		15	0	10	0	2	0	2	0	1	0	1	15	0	16
31	SULLIVAN HIGH	APPROVED		10	0	0	0	2	0	6	0	2	0	1	10	0	11
31	TAFT HIGH	APPROVED		8	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	10
31	VON STEUBEN METRO	APPROVED		6	1	4	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	6	1	8
31	WELLS COMM. ACADEMY	APPROVED		15	0	5	0	0	0	4	0	6	0	2	15	0	17
31	WESTINGHOUSE VOC	APPROVED		12	1	11	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	1	15
31	WILSON OCC HIGH	APPROVED		8	0	2	0	4	0	1	0	1	0	2	8	0	10
DISTRICT 31 TOTALS:		26	0	374	18	170	12	36	3	130	3	38	0	63	374	18	455
32	CHICAGO METRO HIGH	DISAPPROVED		0	48	0	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	48
32	COOK COUNTY JAIL																
32	COLLINS HIGH	APPROVED		5	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	5
32	CRANE HIGH	APPROVED		8	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	0	13
32	CROWLER VOC HIGH	APPROVED		10	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	10
32	CROWLER HURS PROG																
32	CURIE METRO HIGH	APPROVED		15	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	0	16
32	DUNBAR VOC HIGH	APPROVED		5	1	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	6
32	DUSABLE HIGH	APPROVED		6	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	6
32	FARRAGUT CAREER ACAD	DISAPPROVED		12	47	6	30	4	5	1	3	1	9	0	12	47	59
32	GAGE PARK HIGH	APPROVED		7	1	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	1	10
32	GRAHAM TRAINING CTR	APPROVED		22	0	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	0	22
32	INDUSTRIAL SKILL CTR	APPROVED		6	1	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	1	8
32	JONES METRO HIGH	APPROVED		11	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	11
32	JUAREZ HIGH	APPROVED		32	5	32	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	5	37
32	KELLY HIGH	APPROVED		15	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	0	16
32	KENNEDY HIGH	DISAPPROVED		3	12	3	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	15
32	MANLEY HIGH	APPROVED		9	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	9
32	MARSHALL METRO HIGH	APPROVED		6	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	6
32	PHILLIPS HIGH	APPROVED		9	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	9
32	RICHARDS VOC HIGH	APPROVED		8	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	8
32	SIMPSON ALT HIGH	APPROVED		10	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	10
32	SPALDING PHYS HAND	APPROVED		8	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	8
32	TILDEN HIGH	APPROVED		10	1	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	1	11
32	WASHBURNE TRADE APPR	APPROVED		4	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4
32	YOUNG MAGNET	APPROVED		19	2	19	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	19	2	26
DISTRICT 32 TOTALS:		21	3	240	118	234	101	4	5	1	3	1	9	15*	240	118	373
33	BOGAN HIGH	APPROVED		22	1	8	0	3	1	10	0	1	0	0	22	1	23
33	BOLINGBROOK ALT HIGH																
33	SKILLS OF LIVING BR																

Appendix I

		BOARD FIGURES													CORRECTED TOTALS		
		APPROVAL		TOTAL VOTING		PARENTS		RESIDENTS		TEACHERS		OTHER			TOTAL VOTING		TOTAL ATTENDANCE
DIST	SCHOOL NAME	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	NON VOTING	YES	NO	
33	BOWEN HIGH	APPROVED		15	2	6	2	1	0	5	0	3	0	0	15	2	17
33	CALUMET HIGH	APPROVED		4	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	4	0	4
33	CALVER HIGH	APPROVED		18	6	4	5	1	0	1	0	12	1	0	18	6	24
33	CHS FOR AGRIC SCIENC	DISAPPROVED		0	15	0	11	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	15	15
33	CHICAGO VOC HIGH	DISAPPROVED		5	23	5	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	23	30
33	CORLISS HIGH	APPROVED		11	2	8	1	1	0	2	0	0	1	0	11	2	13
33	ENGLEWOOD HIGH	APPROVED		13	1	11	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	1	14
33	FENGER HIGH	APPROVED		39	0	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3	39	0	42
33	HAITIAN COMM. ACADEMY	APPROVED		12	0	6	0	0	0	5	0	1	0	1	12	0	13
33	HARPER HIGH	APPROVED		5	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	9	5	0	14
33	HIRSCH METRO HIGH	APPROVED		8	2	6	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	8	2	11
33	HUBBARD HIGH	APPROVED		10	0	3	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	2	10	0	12
33	HYDE PARK CAREER ACD	APPROVED		23	0	14	0	3	0	6	0	0	0	1	23	0	24
33	JULIAN HIGH	APPROVED		16	0	7	0	0	0	6	0	3	0	0	16	0	16
33	KENWOOD ACADEMY	APPROVED		6	0	4	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	6	0	7
33	KING HIGH	APPROVED		7	1	3	1	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	7	1	8
33	LA CASAS OCC	APPROVED		9	0	4	0	0	0	3	0	2	0	0	9	0	9
33	LINDBLOM TECH HIGH	APPROVED		12	0	7	0	0	0	3	0	2	0	0	12	0	12
33	MORGAN PARK HIGH	DISAPPROVED		7	17	6	6	1	4	0	7	0	0	1	7	17	25
33	ROBESON HIGH	APPROVED		51	6	38	3	5	2	1	0	7	1	15	51	6	72
33	SIMEON VOC HIGH	APPROVED		15	0	6	0	1	0	5	0	3	0	0	15	0	15
33	SOUTH SHORE HIGH	APPROVED		8	6	3	5	1	0	2	1	2	0	2	8	6	16
33	SULLIVAN ALT HIGH																
33	WASHINGTON HIGH	APPROVED		12	0	6	0	3	0	1	0	2	0	0	12	0	12
DISTRICT 33 TOTALS:		21	3	328	82	196	59	26	10	66	10	40	3	38*	328	82	448

*VOTER TOTALS AND DISAPPROVALS ARE REVISED FIGURES BOARD'S ORIGINAL DATA.

Appendix II

BUDGET HEARING SURVEY

How many of the budget hearing participants were (please write number):
Parents _____ Residents _____ Teachers _____ Other: _____ TOTAL _____

Your school budget was: Approved _____ Disapproved _____

The vote was (please write number): For _____ Against _____ TOTAL _____

The explanation of the school budget was:
Complete and informative _____ Adequate _____ Incomplete _____

Were all the questions raised at the budget hearing sufficiently answered?
Yes _____ No _____ Not certain (please explain): _____
_____

Who conducted your budget hearing: Principal ____ LSIC President _____
Other (please specify): _____

The recommendations/objections raised were (check as many as apply):

Need for more textbooks	( )
Need for more educational supplies	( )
Need for more equipment/furniture	( )
Need for improved maintenance and repairs	( )
To have more computers/software in the school	( )
The need for more staff	( )
The need for more programs	( )
The need for longer school hours	( )
Provide extra funds for summer programs	( )
The need for better prepared lunch food	( )

Other (please specify):
1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

The Panel provides technical assistance to schools and community organizations. Would you like assistance? Yes _____ No _____

Your Name (please print): _____
Address: _____ Zip Code _____
Phone Number: _____
Are you the LSIC president at your school? Yes _____ No _____

Appendix III

SCHOOL BUDGET HEARINGS
CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MARCH 10 & 12, 1987

		VOTE DATA				CATEGORY OF VOTERS					MEETING LEADER	
SCHOOL	DIST	VOTE OUTCOME	YES	NO	NUMBER VOTING	PARENTS	RESENTS	TEACHERS	OTHRS	TOTAL	PRIN	LSIC
ELEMENTARY												
BEARD	1	Approved	2	0	2	2	0	0	2	4	X	
EDISON	1	Approved	3	1	4	4	0	0	4	8	X	
GARVY	1	Disapproved	0	5	5	4	0	1	1	6	X	
HAUGAN	1	Approved	11	1	12							
HENRY	1	Approved	11	0	11	10	0	1	0	11	X	X
HIBBARD	1	Approved	26	3	29	12	1	16	0	29	X	
ORIOLE PARK	1	Approved	8	0	8							
PALMER	1	Approved	17	7	24							
PORTAGE PARK	1	Approved	16	0	16	8	1	8	3	20		X
PRUSSING	1	Approved	13	6	19							
SMYSER	1	Approved	8	0	8	7	0	0	1	8	X	X
ARMSTRONG	2	Approved	40	2	42	10	2	30	0	42	X	X
BOONE	2	Approved	38	0	38	6	2	28	3	39		X
CHAPPELL	2	Approved	13	0	13	3	0	10	2	15	X	
CLINTON	2	Approved	8	2	10	8	0	2	2	12	X	
DECATUR	2	Approved	19	0	19	9	0	10	0	19	X	X
KILMER	2	Approved	20	0	20							
McPHERSON	2	Approved	25	0	25	1	1	23	0	25		
AGASSIZ	3	Approved	23	0	23							
BLAINE	3	Approved	19	1	20	16	0	4	2	22		
BURLEY	3	Disapproved	5	8	13							
COOLEY	3	Approved	13	0	13							
LINCOLN	3	Approved	47	0	47	28	0	20	0	48	X	X
MAYER	3	Approved	4	3	7							
MULLIGAN	3	Approved	9	0	9							
OGDEN	3	Approved	6	0	6	4	2	0	2	8	X	X
BURBANK	4	Approved	13	0	13	10	0	0	3	13	X	X
EXFORD	4	Approved	10	0	10	10	0	0	1	11	X	X
DEVER	4	Approved	14	0	14	8	1	5	2	16	X	X
FALCONER	4	Approved	21	0	21	9	4	8	1	22	X	
LOCKE	4	Approved	17	0	17	16	0	1	1	18	X	X
SCHUBERT	4	Disapproved	20	22	44	29	3	14	3	49	X	X
AVONDALE	5	Approved	30	2	32	15	1	14	3	33		X
FUNSTON	5	Disapproved	6	8	14	5	2	7	0	14	X	X
GOETHE	5	Disapproved	0	15	15							
JAHN	5	Approved	8	0	8							
LIDNE	5	Approved	9	1	10	5	0	4	1	10	X	
MORSE	5	Approved	24	1	25							
MOZART	5	Approved	14	3	17	14	0	4	1	19	X	X
CARPENTER	6	Approved	5	0	5							
CHOPIN	6	Disapproved	15	16	31	27	0	4	3	34	X	X
DIXON	6	Disapproved	0	7	7	5	0	0	4	9	X	
DRUMMOND	6	Approved	2	0	2							
NORTH SIDE	6	Approved	13	0	13	8	0	3	2	13	X	X
OTIS	6	Approved				2	6	1	3	12		
PRITZKER	6	Disapproved	0	14	14	13	0	1	1	15	X	X
SABIN	6	Disapproved	0	133	133	114	11	10	3	138	X	X
DELANO	7	Approved	17	6	23	15	0	8	0	23	X	
DEPRIEST	7	Approved	4	1	5	5	0	0	2	7		X
DOUGLASS	7	Approved	9	2	11	6	0	0	5	11		X
EMMET	7	Approved	3	1	4	7	0	1	1	9	X	
NASH	7	Approved	9	1	10							
SPENCER	7	Approved	3	0	3	1	0	2	2	5	X	
COOPER UGC	8	Approved	15	0	15							
GUNSAULUS	8	Approved	21	0	21	7	0	14	0	21	X	X
PICKARD	8	Approved	10	2	12							
SALAZAR	8	Disapproved	10	15	25	22	0	3	4	29	X	
GLADSTONE	9	Approved	20	3	23	14	6	5	0	25	X	
JACKSON, A.	9	Disapproved	3	7	10	6	0	5	1	12	X	
JEFFERSON	9	Approved	20	4	24	4	0	20	0	24	X	X

Appendix III

SCHOOL	DIST	RECOMMENDATIONS-OBJECTIONS										
		TEXTS	SUPPLS	EQUIP	BETTER MAINTN	COMPUT	MORE STAFF	MORE PROGMS	LONGER HOURS	SUMMER PROGRMS	BETTER LUNCH	OTHER
ELEMENTARY												
BEARD	1							X				
EDISON	1		X									
GARVY	1						X	X		X		
HAUGAN	1											
HENRY	1	X	X	X		X						
HIBBARD	1	X	X	X	X						X	
ORIOLE PARK	1											
PALMER	1											
PORTAGE PARK	1		X				X				X	
PRUSSING	1											
SMYSER	1				X							
ARMSTRONG	2	X	X				X					
BOONE	2	X	X									
CHAPPELL	2				X			X				X
CLINTON	2				X							X
DECATUR	2		X	X								
KELVYN	2											
McPHERSON	2											
AGASSIZ	3											
BLAINE	3											
BURLEY	3											
COOLEY	3											
LINCOLN	3											
MAYER	3											
MULLIGAN	3											
OGDEN	3											
BURBANK	4	X			X							
BYFORD	4	X										X
DEVER	4											
FALCONER	4	X	X	X								X
LOOMIS	4											
SCHUBERT	4	X	X		X	X	X	X				
AVONDALE	5	X			X						X	
FUNSTON	5	X			X							X
GOETHE	5											
JAHN	5											
LOWE	5											
MORSE	5											
McCART	5	X			X							X
CARPENTER	6											
CHOPIN	6	X	X	X	X							
DIEGO	6				X		X					
DRUMMOND	6											
NORTH SIDE	6											
OTIS	6											
PRITZKER	6	X	X	X	X		X					X
SABIN	6	X	X	X				X			X	
DELANO	7	X	X	X		X	X					
DEPRIEST	7		X									
DOUGLASS	7	X		X								
EMMET	7	X	X		X	X	X					X
NASH	7											
SPENCER	7											
COOPER UGC	8											
GINSAULUS	8											
PICKARD	8											
SALAZAR	8	X										
GLADSTONE	9		X									
JACKSON, A.	9	X	X									
JEFFERSON	9				X			X				

Appendix III

SCHOOL	DIST	VOTE DATA: VOTE OUTCOME	YES	NO	NUMBER VOTING	CATEGORY OF VOTERS: PARENTS	RESNTS	TEACHERS	OTHRS	TOTAL	MEETING LEADER: PRIN	LSIC
SKINNER	9	Approved	11	2	13	10	0	4	3	17		X
SMYTH	9	Approved	34	4	38							
BURNS	10	Approved	40	35	75	35	5	40	3	83		
CORKERY	10	Disapproved	27	78	105							
HANSBERRY	10	Approved	14	2	16	11	0	3	2	16	X	X
WHITNEY	10	Disapproved	9	89	98	90	2	7	1	100	X	X
DRAKE	11	Approved	10	0	10							
HEALY	11	Approved	5	0	5	4	0	1	0	5	X	
HOLDEN	11	Approved	13	0	13	8	0	3	2	13	X	X
PERSHING	11	Approved	9	0	9	6	0	2	2	10	X	X
FLEMING	12	Approved	10	0	10	1	0	9	3	13	X	X
GRIMES	12	Approved	18	0	18	3	0	11	4	18	X	X
HEARST	12	Approved	32	10	42	14	3	28	1	46		
NIGTINGALE	12	Approved	27	1	28	8	1	19	0	28	X	X
SAWYER	12	Approved	15	0	15	12	0	2	3	17	X	X
TWAIN	12	Disapproved	6	20	26	20	0	4	3	27	X	
BEALE	13	Approved	23	0	23	5	1	6	10	22		
DEWEY	13	Approved	4	0	4	3	0	1	3	7		
FARREN	13	Approved	22	1	23	18	2	2	1	23		X
FULLER	14	Approved	10	0	10	9	0	9	1	19		X
HARTE	14	Approved	1	0	1	0	1	0	2	3		
MOLLISON	14	Approved	17	0	17	8	1	8	1	18		X
PRICE	14	Approved	9	2	11	2	0	9	0	11		
SEXTON	14	Disapproved	4	6	10	7	1	1	1	10	X	
SHOESMITH	14	Approved	11	2	13	10	1	2	2	15	X	
WIRTH	14	Disapproved	0	1	1	1	0	0	2	3	X	
ALTGELD	15	Approved	18	0	18	14	2	1	1	18	X	X
BARTON	15	Approved	9	0	9	8	0	1	2	11		
DAWES	15	Approved	10	1	11	4	3	3	2	12		
EARLE	15	Approved	6	0	6	5	1	0	2	8		X
EBERHART	15	Approved	17	1	18							
FRANKLIN	15	Disapproved	10	13	23	13	0	9	2	24		X
GOODLOW	15	Approved	12	0	12	6	1	5	0	12	X	
LEE	15	Disapproved	4	5	9	6	0	3	3	12		X
DAVIS	16	Approved	13	0	13	13	0	1	5	19	X	
CUFFE	16	Disapproved	3	6	9	9	0	2	0	11		X
HINTON	16	Approved	6	0	6	5	1	0	2	8		X
BROWNELL	17	Approved	16	1	17	6	0	9	2	17		X
CALDWELL	17	Approved	10	6	16	6	4	6	0	16	X	X
DENEEN	17	Approved	2	0	2	1	0	1	1	3	X	
DIXON	17	Disapproved	1	18	19	14	2	3	0	19	X	
McDOWELL	17	Disapproved	2	2	4							
NINOS HEROES	17	Approved	4	0	4							
PARK MANOR	17	Approved	81	0	81	66	2	12	1	81	X	X
CASSELL	18	Approved				4	0	8	1	13		
KELLER	18	Approved	14	0	14	12	0	2	1	15		X
KELLOGG	18	Approved	25	0	25	20	0	4	1	25	X	X
KIPLING	18	Approved	4	3	7	6	0	2	4	12		
MORGAN	18	Disapproved	0	13	13	7	3	3	0	13		X
SUTHERLAND	18	Approved	12	1	13	6	0	6	3	15		X
GILLESPIE	19	Approved										
HOYNE	19	Approved	13	2	15	13	1	1	3	18		
TAYLOR	19	Approved	15	1	16	14	0	2	0	16	X	
ALDRIDGE	20	Disapproved	0	14	14	7	0	5	3	15		X
CULLEN	20	Approved	7	1	8	5	1	0	3	9		X
DUNNE	20	Approved	16	0	16	7	4	4	1	16		
TOTAL:			1480	644	2126	1071	86	551	162	1870		
PERCENT:			70%	30%	100%	57%	5%	29%	9%	100%		

Appendix III

SCHOOL	DIST	RECOMMENDATIONS-OBJECTIONS										
		TEXTS	SUPPLS	EQUIP	BETTER MAINTN	COMPUT	MORE STAFF	MORE PROGMS	LONGER HOURS	SUMMER PROGRMS	BETTER LUNCH	OTHER
ELEMENTARY												
SKINNER	9	X	X	X								X
SMITH	9											
BURNS	10	X										X
CONKEY	10											
HANSBERRY	10											
WHITNEY	10				X							X
DRAKE	11											
HEALY	11	X	X	X	X						X	
HOLDEN	11				X						X	
PERSHING	11	X	X									
FLEMING	12	X	X				X					
GRIMES	12											
HEARST	12											
NIGHTINGALE	12	X	X	X	X	X						
SAWYER	12											
TWAIN	12					X	X					
BEALE	13						X					
DEWEY	13											
FARREN	13	X	X	X	X		X	X				X
FULLER	14	X	X		X	X	X	X			X	
HARTE	14											
MOLLISON	14		X	X						X	X	
PRICE	14											
SEXTON	14	X				X	X					
SHOESMITH	14				X							
WIRTH	14	X						X			X	
ALTGELD	15				X							
BARTON	15	X			X							
DAWES	15						X					
EARLE	15		X	X	X							
EBERHART	15	X	X									X
FRANKLIN	15		X	X	X	X		X				
GOODLOW	15		X									
LEE	15	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X
BASS	16				X							
CUFFE	16	X			X			X				
HINTON	16	X										
BROWNELL	17											
CALDWELL	17	X		X	X		X	X		X		X
DENEEN	17				X							
DIXON	17	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				
McDOWELL	17				X							
NINOS HEROES	17											
PARK MANOR	17											
CASSELL	18											
KELLER	18											
KELLOGG	18											
KIPLING	18	X	X									
MORGAN	18	X	X	X							X	X
SUTHERLAND	18											
GILLESPIE	19											
HOYNE	19				X		X				X	
TAYLOR	19	X	X		X		X	X			X	
ALDRIDGE	20											X
CULLEN	20	X	X				X	X		X		X
DUNNE	20											

Appendix III

SCHOOL	DIST	VOTE DATA: VOTE OUTCOME	YES	NO	NUMBER VOTING	CATEGORY OF VOTERS: PARENTS	RESDNTS	TEACHERS	OTHRS	TOTAL	MEETING LEADER: PRIN	LSIC
HIGH SCHOOLS												
AMUNDSEN	31	Approved	10	0	10	0	1	10	3	14	X	
CLEMENTE	31	Approved	19	1	20							
KELVYN PARK	31	Approved	25	0	25	14	1	7	6	28	X	X
LAKE VIEW	31	Approved	33	7	40	20	5	7	0	32		X
LANE	31	Approved	10	2	12	9	3	0	0	12	X	X
MATHER	31	Approved	36	1	37	8	3	27	0	38	X	X
SENN	31	Approved	29	3	32	10	4	18	0	32		
WELLS	31	Approved	15	0	15	4	4	4	3	15	X	X
CHOO METRO	32	Disapproved	0	48	48	40	0	8	0	48	X	
CURIE	32	Approved				8	1	1	6	16	X	X
DUNBAR	32	Approved										
FARRAGUT	32	Disapproved	11	48	59	55	1	3	2	61	X	X
JUAREZ	32	Approved	32	15	47	26	4	15	2	47		X
KELLY	32	Approved	14	0	14	6	2	6	0	14	X	X
MARSHALL	32	Approved	6	0	6							
CHS AG SCI	33	Disapproved	0	15	15	11	3	1	0	15	X	
CHOO VOC	33	Disapproved	5	23	28	28	0	2	1	31	X	X
HUBBARD	33	Approved	11	0	11	6	1	4	2	13	X	X
KENWOOD	33	Approved	5	0	5	4	1	0	2	7	X	X
LINDBLOM	33	Approved	5	0	5	4	0	1	2	7		
MORGAN PARK	33	Disapproved	7	17	24	15	5	7	0	27	X	
		TOTAL:	273	180	453	268	39	160	29	457		
		PERCENT:	60%	40%	100%	59%	9%	35%	6%	100%		

Appendix III

SCHOOL	DIST	RECOMMENDATIONS-OBJECTIONS									
		TEXTS	SUPPLS	EQUIP	BETTER MAINTN	COMPUT	MORE STAFF	MORE PROGMS	LONGER HOURS	SUMMER PROGRMS	BETTER LUNCH	OTHER
HIGH SCHOOLS												
AMUNDSEN	31	X	X	X	X				X			X
CLEMENTE	31											
KELVYN PARK	31		X		X		X					
LAKE VIEW	31	X	X	X	X		X			X		
LANE	31				X							X
MATHER	31	X	X	X	X		X	X	X			X
SENN	31											
WELLS	31											
CHGO METRO	32											
CURIE	32											
DUNBAR	32											
FARRAGUT	32	X	X	X								
JUAREZ	32	X			X							
KELLY	32	X	X	X	X		X					
MARSHALL	32											
CHS AG SCI	33	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X
CHGO VOC	33			X	X		X					
HUBBARD	33	X	X								X	X
KENWOOD	33											
LINDBLOM	33											
MORGAN PARK	33	X	X	X	X		X		X			

Appendix IV

CHICAGO BOARD OF EDUCATION 1987 BUDGET HEARINGS
DISAPPROVED BUDGETS

		TOTAL VOTE		PARENTS		RESIDENT		TEACHERS		OTHERS		ATTENDANCE
SCHOOL	DIST	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	
GARVY	1	0	5	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	5
BURLEY	3	5	8	2	3	0	3	3	2	0	0	13
FRANKLIN	3	10	13	0	13	0	0	8	0	2	0	24
SCHUBERT	4	20	22	14	20	1	1	5	1	0	0	42
FUNSTON	5	6	8	0	5	0	3	6	0	0	0	14
GOETHE	5	0	15	0	13	0	2	0	0	0	0	26
MONROE	5	0	8	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
RYERSON	5	0	12	0	9	0	2	0	0	0	1	12
STOWE	5	0	20	0	16	0	0	0	1	0	3	20
CHOPIN	6	15	16	11	16	0	0	4	0	0	0	31
DIEGO	6	0	7	0	5	0	0	0	2	0	0	7
PRITZKER	6	0	14	0	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	14
SABIN	6	0	133	0	114	0	5	0	8	0	6	133
CLARK, M.	7	4	7	1	2	0	2	1	3	0	0	9
SALAZAR	8	10	15	7	15	0	0	3	0	0	0	29
JACKSON, A.	9	3	7	0	3	0	0	3	1	0	0	12
CORKERY	10	27	78	6	62	2	12	19	0	1	0	112
WHITNEY	10	9	85	8	71	0	0	0	17	1	0	109
LIBBY	12	10	11	6	9	0	0	3	1	1	1	21
TWAIN	12	6	20	1	19	0	1	4	0	0	0	27
SEXTON	14	4	6	4	3	0	1	0	1	0	0	10
WIRTH	14	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
LEE	15	4	5	0	6	0	0	3	0	0	0	12
COFFE	16	3	6	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	12
DIXON	17	1	18	0	14	0	2	1	0	0	2	19
MANN	17	0	14	0	10	0	2	0	2	0	0	14
McDOWELL*	17	2	2									
O'KEEFFE	17	2	6	0	5	0	0	2	1	0	0	8
PIRIE	17	3	9	1	6	0	0	0	3	2	0	12
BRENAN	18	4	9	0	6	0	0	4	3	0	0	13
FORT DEARBORN	18	2	11	0	10	0	1	2	0	0	0	13
MORGAN	18	0	13	0	4	0	6	0	3	0	0	13
TURNER-DREW	18	1	10	0	9	0	0	1	1	0	0	11
ADDAMS	19	1	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	3
MARSH	19	0	6	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	6
ALDRIDGE	20	0	15	0	6	0	0	0	5	0	3	14
METRO	32	0	48	0	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
KENNEDY	32	3	12	0	10	0	0	3	2	12	3	15
FARRAGUT	32	11	48	6	33	1	5	1	3	1	9	46
CHGO VOC H.S.	33	5	23	5	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	
MORGAN PARK	33	7	17	6	6	1	4	0	7	0	0	25
CHGO AGRI SCI	33	0	15	0	11	0	3	0	1	0	0	15
TOTAL		178	800	81	643	5	55	76	70	21	30	980

*McDowell did not hold a second budget hearing.

Appendix V

SCHOOL BUDGET HEARINGS
CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MARCH 10 & 12, 1987

SCHOOL	DIST	OUTCOME	APPV'G	DISAPP'G	VOTING	PARENTS	RESDNTS	TEACHERS	OTHRS	PRSNT
GARVY	1	+	+	+	+	8	1	0	1	10
BURLEY	3	Approved	6	0	6	1	2	0	3	6
FRANKLIN	3	Approved	9	0	9	6	0	2	4	12
SCHUBERT	4	Disapproved	2	17	19	20	2	4	3	29
FUNSTON	5	Disapproved	6	8	14	9	1	2	2	14
MONROE	5	Disapproved	0	7	7	6	1	1	2	10
RYERSON	5	Disapproved	0	9	9	9	0	0	4	13
STOWE	5	Approved	8	0	8	8	0	0	1	9
PRITZKER	6	Approved	24	0	24	19	0	5	1	25
SABIN	6	Disapproved	0	35	35	35	0	5	1	41
CLARK, M.	7	Approved	7	2	9	3	0	4	2	9
SALAZAR	8	Approved	16	1	17	9	0	6	2	17
CORKERY	10	Disapproved	3	23	26	25	0	1	4	30
LIBBY	12	Approved	6	0	6	5	0	1	0	6
PASTEUR	12	Approved	5	1	6	3	1	2	0	6
TWAIN	12	Approved	9	0	9	7	0	2	2	11
WIRTH	14	Approved	3	2	5	3	0	0	2	5
LEE	15	Approved	38	6	44	33	5	6	3	47
CUFFE	16	Approved	15	2	17	10	1	4	2	17
DIXON	17	Disapproved	2	11	13	9	1	0	4	14
MANN	17	Disapproved	1	23	24	*	*	*	*	*
McDOWELL	17	*								
O'KEEFFE	17	Disapproved	3	3	6	3	0	2	3	8
MARSH	19	Disapproved	*	*	*	5	1	0	2	8
FARRAGUT	32	Approved	24	0	24	17	4	6	3	30
MORGAN PARK	33	Disapproved	1	12	13	8	3	2	0	13
		TOTAL:	188	162	350	261	23	55	51	390
		PERCENTAGE:	54%	46%	100%	67%	6%	14%	13%	100%

Notes: + no vote was taken
* second meeting was not held

Appendix VI

SURVEY

School Name: _____

PART I: LOCAL SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT COUNCIL SURVEY

Please fill in the following information as accurately as you can. Thank you!

How many members are in your Local School Improvement Council (LSIC)? ____

How many are (please write in number): Parents? ____ Community members? ____
Teachers? ____ Students? ____ Other (please specify): ____

How often does your LSIC meet: Twice a month ____ Once a month ____
Other (please specify) _____

When are your LSIC meetings held? Day ____ Evening ____ Weekends ____

Where are your LSIC meetings held? School ____ Bank ____ Field House ____
Police Station ____ Other (please specify): ____

Please check the category that best applies, using the guideline below.

	Always	Some-times	Rarely	Never
1. How often does your principal attend your LSIC meetings?	( )	( )	( )	( )
2. Has your principal submitted to your LSIC a proposal before spending from his/her discretionary funds?	( )	( )	( )	( )
3. Has your LSIC disapproved any such proposal (please give details on a blank piece of paper)?	( )	( )	( )	( )
4. Have the following attended your LSIC meeting when invited:				
(a) the building engineer?	( )	( )	( )	( )
(b) the lunchroom manager?	( )	( )	( )	( )
5. How often has your LSIC disapproved spending for:				
(a) textbooks?	( )	( )	( )	( )
(b) supplies?	( )	( )	( )	( )
(c) Supplementary State Title I?	( )	( )	( )	( )
(d) Gifted program materials?	( )	( )	( )	( )
(e) Desegregation programs?	( )	( )	( )	( )
(f) money raised from the school's fundraisers in the principal's internal accounts?	( )	( )	( )	( )

	YES	NO
6. Has your LSIC done a needs assessment on your school?	( )	( )
7. Has your LSIC developed a school improvement plan?	( )	( )
8. Has your LSIC president received training on the budget hearing from his/her district office?	( )	( )
9. Has your LSIC written its bylaws?	( )	( )

Appendix VII

1987 LOCAL SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT COUNCIL SURVEY

SCHOOL NAME	TYPE SCHOOL	DIST	# IN LSIC	NUMBERS OF PARNTS	CMMTY	TCH	STDN	OTHER	FREQUENCY OF MEETINGS 2xMTH	1xMTH	5XYR	4XYR	<4XYR	TIMES OF MEETINGS DAY	EVENG	MEETING PLACE SCHOOL	OTHER
Beard	elem	1	8	5	3	0	0	0		X				X		X	
Beaubien	elem	1	220	200	19	1	0	0					X	X		X	
Belding	elem	1	5	5	0	0	0	0				X			X	X	
Ebinger	elem	1	5	4	0	1	0	0					X	X		X	
Edgebrook	elem	1	26	16	10	0	0	0					X	X		X	
Edison	elem	1	12	11	1	0	0	0				X		X		X	
Garvy	elem	1	196	171	5	20	0	0		X				X		X	
Haugan	elem	1	ALL										X	X		X	
Henry	elem	1	3	3	0	0	0	0					X		X	X	
Murphy	elem	1	12	10	2	0	0	0					X		X	X	
North Side	elem	1	88	56	2	28	2	0		X				X		X	
Palmer	elem	1	204	180	0	22	0	2			X			X	X	X	
Peterson	elem	1	300	266	4	30	0	0				X		X	X	X	X
Portage Pk	elem	1	ALL							X				X		X	
Prussing	elem	1	10	10	0	0	0	0		X				X		X	
Armstrong	elem	2	30	21	4	5	0	0		X					X	X	X
Chappell	elem	2	8	5	0	1	0	2		X				X		X	
Decauter	elem	2	285	233	34	18	0	0		X				X		X	
Field	elem	2	25	20	0	6	0	0				X			X	X	X
Hayt	elem	2	ALL							X				X		X	
Kilmer	elem	2	15	13	0	1	0	1		X				X		X	
Rogers	elem	2	338	302	0	29	0	7		X				X	X	X	
Trumbull	elem	2	5	5	0	0	0	0		X				X		X	
Burley	elem	3	74	42	7	23	0	2			X			X		X	
Franklin	elem	3	200	200						X					X		X
Hamilton	elem	3	260	170	60	28	0	2					X	X		X	
Inter-American	elem	3	20	19	0	1	0	0		X					X	X	X
Jenner	elem	3	27	15	5	3	0	0		X				X		X	
Nettelhorst	elem	3	11	9	0	1	0	1		X					X		X
Ogden	elem	3	16	13	0	3	0	0		X						X	X
Ravenswood	elem	3	130	96	15	18	0	1			X			X	X	X	
Truth	elem	3	20	17	2	1	0	0		X				X		X	
Burbank	elem	4	60	52	0	7	0	1		X				X		X	
Dever	elem	4	200	74	4	20	0	2		X				X		X	
Locke	elem	4	263	259	0	3	0	1		X				X	X	X	X
Lyon	elem	4	147	112	0	25	0	8		X				X		X	
Schubert	elem	4	12	7	1	4	0	0		X				X		X	X
Brentano	elem	5	20	16	0	4	0	0		X				X		X	
Funston	elem	5	20	19	1	0	0	0		X				X		X	
Jahn	elem	5							X					X	X	X	
McDowell	elem	5	25	23	0	2	0	0		X					X	X	
Monroe	elem	5	200	164	5	30	5	1		X				X	X	X	
Morse	elem	5	65	52	8	1	1	3		X				X		X	
Mozart	elem	5	7	5	0	2	0	0		X				X		X	
Pulaski	elem	5	10	3	0	3	0	4			X			X		X	
Reilly	elem	5	9	6	1	1	0	1		X				X		X	
Ryerson	elem	5	18	17	0	0	0	1		X				X		X	

Appendix VII

SCHOOL NAME	TYPE SCHOOL	PRIN ATNDS MEETINGS			PRIN SUBMIT PROPOSAL			LSIC EVER DISAPPRV			ENG OR LUNCH ATTENDS			MEETS ASSESS		SCH IMP PLAN		PRES TRAINED		LSIC BYLAWS	
		A	S	N	A	S	N	A	S	N	A	S	N	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
Beard	elem	X			X					X	X				X		X	X			X
Beaubien	elem	X			X					X			X		X		X		X	X	
Belding	elem	X					X			X			X		X		X	X		X	
Ebinger	elem	X			X					X			X		X		X	X		X	
Edgebrook	elem	X			X					X	X				X		X	X		X	
Edison	elem	X				X				X			X		X		X	X		X	
Garvy	elem	X				X				X			X		X		X	X			X
Haugan	elem	X					X			X	X				X	X		X		X	
Henry	elem	X			X					X	X			X		X		X		X	
Murphy	elem	X					X			X			X		X		X		X	X	
North Side	elem	X			X					X	X				X		X		X	X	
Palmer	elem	X				X				X	X				X		X	X		X	
Peterson	elem	X			X					X	X			X			X	X		X	
Portage Pk	elem	X			X					X	X				X		X	X		X	
Prussing	elem	X			X					X	X				X		X	X		X	
Armstrong	elem	X			X					X			X		X		X	X		X	
Chappell	elem	X			X					X	X				X		X	X		X	
Decatur	elem	X											X	X			X	X		X	
Field	elem		X				X			X	X				X		X		X	X	
Hayt	elem	X					X			X	X				X		X		X	X	
Kilmer	elem	X			X					X	X			X			X			X	
Rogers	elem	X			X					X			X		X		X	X		X	
Trumbull	elem	X				X				X			X	X		X					
Burley	elem	X				X				X	X			X			X	X		X	
Franklin	elem	X					X			X	X				X	X		X		X	
Hamilton	elem	X					X			X	X				X		X	X		X	
Inter-American	elem	X			X					X			X	X			X	X		X	
Jenner	elem		X			X				X	X				X	X			X	X	
Nettelhorst	elem	X			X					X	X				X		X	X		X	
Ogden	elem				X					X	X				X		X		X	X	
Ravenswood	elem	X			X					X	X			X		X			X	X	
Truth	elem	X				X				X			X	X		X		X			X
Burbank	elem	X			X					X	X			X		X		X			X
Dever	elem	X			X					X	X			X		X		X		X	
Locke	elem	X					X			X	X				X	X		X		X	
Lyon	elem	X				X				X	X				X		X		X	X	
Schubert	elem		X				X			X	X			X			X	X		X	
Brentano	elem	X			X					X			X	X		X			X	X	
Funston	elem		X		X					X	X			X		X			X	X	
Jahn	elem	X			X					X	X			X		X			X	X	
McDowell	elem	X				X				X	X			X		X			X	X	
Monroe	elem		X			X				X	X			X		X			X	X	
Morse	elem	X				X			X		X			X		X		X		X	
Mozart	elem	X				X				X			X		X		X	X		X	
Pulaski	elem	X			X					X	X				X			X		X	
Reilly	elem	X			X					X	X			X			X		X	X	
Ryerson	elem	X					X			X		X			X		X		X		X

Appendix VII

SCHOOL NAME	TYPE SCHOOL	DIST	# IN LSIC	NUMBERS OF					FREQUENCY OF MEETINGS					TIMES OF MEETINGS		MEETING PLACE	
				PARNTS	COMTY	TCH	STDN	OTHER	2x+MTH	1xMTH	5XYR	4XYR	<4XYR	DAY	EVENG	SCHOOL	OTHER
Stowe	elem	5	9	9	0	0	0	0		X				X		X	
Von Linne	elem	5	6	6	0	0	0	0	X					X		X	
Diego	elem	6	4	4	0	0	0	0		X				X	X	X	
Gary	elem	6	60	25	15	20	0	0		X				X	X	X	X
Pritzker	elem	6	20	19	0	1	0	0		X				X	X	X	
Sabin	elem	6	15	14	0	0	0	1		X				X	X	X	
Clark, M	elem	7	20	18	1	1	0	0		X					X	X	X
DePriest	elem	7	17	16	0	1	0	0		X				X		X	
Delano	elem	7	25	19	6	0	0	0		X					x	X	
Emmet	elem	7	22	18	2	2	0	0		X				X		X	
Goldblatt	elem	7	25	20	0	5	0	0			X			X		X	
Spencer	elem	7	12	10	0	0	0	2		X				X		X	
Tilton	elem	7	25	24	1	0	0	0		X				X		X	
Cook	elem	8	60	25	10	25	0	0		X				X		X	
Cooper	elem	8	10	8	1	1	0	0		X				X		X	
Davis	elem	8	4	4	0	0	0	0				X		X	X	X	X
Gunsaulus	elem	8	5	5	0	0	0	0			X			X		X	
Johnson	elem	8	20	20	0	0	0	1		X				X		X	
Jungman	elem	8	8	4	2	2	0	0		X				X		X	
Plamondon	elem	8	13	13	0	0	0	0		X				X		X	
Salazar	elem	8	ALL							X				X		X	
Saucedo	elem	8	9	7	1	1	0	0		X				X		X	
Shields	elem	8	179							X				X	X	X	X
Cather	elem	9	9	7	2	0	0	0		X				X		x	
Dett	elem	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	X					X		X	
Faraday	elem	9	5	5	0	0	0	0		X				X		X	
Jefferson	elem	9	15	13	0	2	0	0		X				X		X	
Miller	elem	9	20	20	0	0	0	0		X				X		X	
Skinner	elem	9	65	56	5	4	0	0		X				X	X	X	X
Burns	elem	10	37	34	2	0	0	1		X				X		X	
Corkery	elem	10	63	63	0	0	0	0		X				X		X	
McCormick	elem	10	50	50	0	0	0	0		X				X	X	X	X
Paderewski	elem	10	20	20	0	0	0	0		X				X		X	
Penn	elem	10	10	5	2	2	0	1			X				X	X	
Amour	elem	11	3	2	1	0	0	0	X					X		X	
Donoghue	elem	11	9	7	0	1	1	0		X				X		X	
Pershing	elem	11	20	11	6	3	0	0		X					X	X	
Fleming Br	elem	12	120	107	1	10	0	2				X		X	X	X	
Grimes	elem	12	50	34	0	12	0	4		X				X		X	
Hearst	elem	12	15							X				X		X	
Henderson	elem	12	7	6	0	0	0	1		X				X		X	
Nightingale	elem	12	300	260	0	40	0	0		X				X		X	
Sawyer	elem	12	5	4	0	1	0	0					X	X		X	
Twain	elem	12	15	11	1	3	0	0			X			X	X	X	X
Dyett	elem	13	35	27	1	5	0	2		X				X		X	
Sherwood	elem	13	10	10	0	0	0	0	X	X				X		X	
Carnigie	elem	14	15	13	0	1	1	0			X			X		X	
Fermi	elem	14	15	8	5	1	0	1	X					X		X	

SCHOOL NAME	TYPE SCHOOL	PRIN ATTNDS MEETINGS			PRIN SUBMIT PROPOSAL			LSIC EVER DISAPPRV			ENG OR LUNCH ATTENDS			NEEDS ASSESS		SCH IMP PLAN		PRES TRAINED		LSIC EVLAMS	
		A	S	N	A	S	N	A	S	N	A	S	N	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
Stow	elem		X		X					X	X			X		X			X	X	
Von Linne	elem	X			X					X			X	X		X		X		X	
Diep	elem	X			X					X			X		X	X				X	
Gary	elem	X			X					X	X			X		X			X	X	
Pritzker	elem	X				X				X			X		X	X		X		X	
Sabin	elem	X			X					X	X				X	X		X		X	
Clark, H	elem	X					X			X	X				X	X		X		X	
DePriest	elem		X			X				X			X		X	X		X			X
Delano	elem			X			X			X	X				X	X				X	
Ebert	elem		X				X			X	X			X		X			X		X
Goldblatt	elem			X			X			X			X							X	
Spencer	elem	X					X			X			X								
Tilton	elem	X			X					X	X			X		X			X		X
Cook	elem	X					X			X	X			X				X		X	
Cooper	elem	X				X				X			X	X				X		X	
Davis	elem	X			X					X		X			X				X		X
Ossaulus	elem	X			X					X	X			X		X			X		X
Jonnson	elem	X			X					X			X	X							
Jungman	elem	X				X			X		X			X		X			X		X
Plamondon	elem		X				X			X	X			X		X			X	X	
Salazar	elem		X				X			X			X		X				X		X
Saunado	elem	X			X				X		X			X		X			X	X	
Shields	elem	X					X			X		X		X		X		X		X	
Cather	elem		X				X			X			X		X				X	X	
Dett	elem	X			X					X			X		X				X		X
Faraday	elem	X			X					X			X	X		X		X		X	
Jefferson	elem	X				X				X			X						X		X
Miller	elem		X		X				X		X				X			X			X
Skinner	elem		X				X			X	X				X			X		X	
Burns	elem	X					X			X	X			X		X		X		X	
Concery	elem		X				X			X					X			X		X	
McCormick	elem		X				X			X			X		X			X			X
Paderewski	elem	X					X			X	X				X			X		X	
Penn	elem	X			X					X			X	X				X		X	
Amur	elem	X				X				X	X			X		X		X		X	
Donoghue	elem		X		X					X		X		X				X		X	
Fleming	elem	X			X				X			X		X		X		X		X	
Fleming Br	elem	X			X					X	X			X		X		X		X	
Grimes	elem	X			X					X	X			X			X	X		X	
Hearst	elem	X					X			X			X			X		X		X	
Henderson	elem	X			X					X	X				X		X	X		X	
Nightingale	elem	X				X				X		X		X			X	X			X
Sawyer	elem	X				X				X	X			X		X		X		X	
Twain	elem		X				X			X	X				X		X	X		X	
Dyett	elem	X			X					X	X			X		X		X		X	
Sherwood	elem	X			X					X	X			X							
Carnegie	elem	X			X					X	X			X		X			X		X
Ferni	elem	X			X					X	X			X		X		X		X	

Appendix VII

SCHOOL NAME	TYPE SCHOOL	DIST	# IN LSIC	NUMBERS OF PARNTS	COMMTY	TCH	STDN	OTHER	FREQUENCY OF MEETINGS 2xMTH	1xMTH	5XYR	4XYR	<4XYR	TIMES OF MEETINGS DAY	EVENG	MEETING PLACE SCHOOL	OTHER
Harte	elem	14	42	42	0	0	0	0		X					X		X
Mollison	elem	14	9	7	2	0	0	0		X				X		X	
Robinson	elem	14	100	90	10	0	0	0		X				X		X	
Wirth	elem	14															
Barton	elem	15	175	100	25	47	0	3			X			X	X	X	
Dawes	elem	15	8	5	2	1	0	0		X				X		X	
Earle	elem	15	23	19	2	2	0	0		X				X	X	X	
Eberhart	elem	15	320	245	50	25	0	0		X				X		X	
Goodlow Magnet	elem	15	5	3	1	1	0	0		X				X		X	
Lee	elem	15	18	18	0	0	0	0		X				X		X	
Paster	elem	15	8	6	0	2	0	0			X			X		X	
Bass	elem	16	104	43	22	39	0	0		X				X		X	
Bond	elem	16	7	7	0	0	0	0		X				X		X	
Cuffe	elem	16	100	86	2	12	0	0		X				X	X	X	X
Goetzals	elem	16	20	20	0	0	0	0		X				X		X	
Hinton	elem	16	25	16	5	2	1	1		X				X		X	
Kerstaw	elem	16	7	5	2	0	0	0		X				X		X	
Brownell	elem	17	7	5	0	2	0	0		X				X		X	
Deneen	elem	17	5	3	1	1	0	0		X				X		X	
Dixon	elem	17	20	15	2	3	0	0				X		X	X	X	X
Mann	elem	17	13	10	2	1	0	0		X				X	X	X	
O'Keffe	elem	17	12	6	0	2	3	1		X				X		X	
Powell	elem	17	40	20	0	20	0	0		X				X		X	
Price	elem	17	52	39	3	10	0	0		X				X	X	X	
Revere	elem	17	ALL							X				X		X	
Tanner	elem	17	13	10	3	0	0	0			X			X		X	
Cassell	elem	18	103								X			X	X	X	
Clissold	elem	18	400							X				X		X	
Greenan	elem	18	10	10	0	0	0	0		X				X		X	
Kellogg	elem	18	15	12	0	3	0	0		X					X		X
Nansen	elem	18	112	83	6	23	0	0		X				X	X	X	
Ryder	elem	18	30	15	10	5	0	0									
Shoop	elem	18	106	62	14	30	0	0		X				X	X	X	
Sutherland	elem	18										X			X	X	X
Vanderpoel	elem	18	380	364	0	16	0	0		X				X	X	X	X
White	elem	18	12	11	0	1	0	0		X				X		X	
Black Magnet	elem	19	120	115	4	0	0	1			X				X		X
Burnside	elem	19	20	13	3	3	0	1				X		X	X	X	
Gallistal	elem	19	17	11	0	4	0	2		X				X		X	
Goldsmith	elem	19	20	15	0	5	0	0		X				X	X	X	
Hoyne	elem	19	41	34	1	6	0	1		X				X	X	X	
Luella	elem	19	6	3	2	1	0	0		X				X		X	
Marsh	elem	19	15	11	0	2	2	0		X				X	X	X	
Shedd	elem	19	7	4	1	2	0	0			X				X	X	X
Taylor	elem	19	15	15	0	0	0	0		X				X		X	
Thorp	elem	19	125	65	8	52	0	0		X				X		X	
Clay	elem	20	8	8	0	0	0	0					X	X		X	
Cullen	elem	20	12	9	1	0	0	2				X			X	X	X

Appendix VII

SCHOOL NAME	TYPE SCHOOL	PRIN ATTNDS MEETINGS			PRIN SUBMIT PROPOSAL			LSIC EVER DISAPPRV			ENG OR LDNCH ATTENDS			NEEDS ASSESS		SCH IMP PLAN		PRES TRAINED		LSIC BYLAWS	
		A	S	N	A	S	N	A	S	N	A	S	N	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
Barte	elem	X			X					X			X	X			X	X		X	
Mollison	elem	X			X					X	X			X		X		X		X	
Robinson	elem	X			X					X	X			X		X		X		X	
Wirth	elem																				
Barton	elem	X			X					X		X		X		X		X		X	
Dawes	elem		X			X				X	X			X			X	X		X	
Earle	elem	X				X				X	X				X		X	X		X	
Ebertart	elem		X			X				X	X			X		X		X		X	
Goodlow Magnet	elem	X			X					X			X		X		X			X	
Lee	elem	X					X			X	X				X		X		X	X	
Paster	elem	X			X					X			X		X		X		X	X	
Rose	elem	X					X			X		X		X		X		X			X
Rood	elem	X			X					X			X		X	X		X		X	
Cuff's	elem		X				X			X	X				X	X			X	X	
Goethals	elem	X			X					X	X			X		X		X		X	
Hinton	elem	X			X					X	X			X		X		X		X	
Kershaw	elem	X					X			X	X			X				X		X	
Brownell	elem	X					X			X	X			X		X		X		X	
Dansen	elem		X			X				X	X				X	X			X	X	
Dixx	elem	X					X			X	X		X	X		X			X		X
Mann	elem		X			X				X	X				X	X		X		X	
O'Keef'e	elem	X					X			X	X			X		X		X			
Powell	elem	X					X			X	X				X		X	X		X	
Price	elem		X				X			X	X				X		X	X		X	
Revere	elem	X			X					X	X			X		X		X		X	
Tanner	elem	X				X				X			X		X		X	X		X	
Cassell	elem	X			X					X	X				X	X		X		X	
Clissold	elem		X		X					X	X			X		X		X		X	
Gresham	elem									X	X				X		X	X		X	
Kellogg	elem	X			X					X					X	X		X		X	
Nansen	elem	X			X					X			X	X			X	X		X	
Ryder	elem													X		X			X	X	
Shoop	elem	X			X					X	X										
Sutherland	elem	X				X				X	X				X	X		X		X	
Vanderpoel	elem	X			X					X	X				X		X		X		X
White	elem		X		X					X	X				X		X	X		X	
Black Magnet	elem	X				X				X	X			X		X		X		X	
Burnside	elem	X			X					X	X			X			X	X		X	
Callistal	elem		X			X				X	X			X		X			X	X	
Goldsmith	elem	X			X					X	X			X			X	X		X	
Hoyne	elem	X			X					X	X				X		X		X	X	
Lusila	elem	X			X					X	X				X		X	X			X
Marsh	elem	X					X			X			X	X			X	X			X
Shedd	elem	X			X					X			X	X		X		X		X	
Taylor	elem	X			X					X	X				X		X	X			X
Thorp	elem	X			X					X	X			X		X		X		X	
Clay	elem	X				X				X	X				X		X	X		X	
Cullen	elem	X					X			X			X	X			X	X		X	

Appendix VII

SCHOOL NAME	TYPE SCHOOL	DIST	# IN LSIC	NUMBERS OF PARTS	COMTY	TCH	STDN	OTHER	FREQUENCY OF MEETINGS 2xMTH	1xMTH	5XQTR	4XQTR	<4XQTR	TIMES OF MEETINGS DAY	EVENG	MEETING PLACE SCHOOL	OTHER
DuBois	elem	20	7	5	0	1	0	1				X		X		X	
Grissom	elem	20	ALL							X				X	X	X	
Owens	elem	20	12	12	0	0	0	0		X				X	X	X	
Pullman	elem	20	18	11	3	4	0	0			X			X		X	
Scanlon	elem	20	10	7	3	0	0	0		X				X		X	
Van Vlissenger	elem	20	20	14	3	3	0	0		X				X		X	
Washington	elem	20	400	366	20	12	0	2		X				X		X	
Lake View	h.s.	31	40	28	5	7	0	0		X				X	X	X	
Lincoln Park	h.s.	31	180	128	0	50	0	2			X				X	X	X
Mather	h.s.	31	361	224	15	60	60	2		X					X	X	
Taft	h.s.	31	550							X				X	X	X	
Wilson	h.s.	31	4	4	0	0	0	0					X	X		X	
Farragut	h.s.	32	48	35	2	5	5	1		X					X	X	
Juarez	h.s.	32	27	19	3	3	2	0	X					X	X	X	
Kelly	h.s.	32	25	7	12	6	0	0				X		X		X	
Young	h.s.	32	15	8	3	3	1	0		X				X	X	X	
Carver	h.s.	33	158							X				X	X	X	X
Chicago Voc	h.s.	33	325	240	25	50	10	0		X					X		X
Harlan	h.s.	33	30	20	5	5	0	0		X				X		X	
King	h.s.	33	6	5	1	0	0	0			X			X		X	
Morgan Park	h.s.	33	150	90	20	30	10	0			X				X	X	
South Shore	h.s.	33	80	33	17	18	11	1		X					X	X	
TOTAL			10,282	6,929	581	1,066	115	79	7	117	19	13	10	102	25	137	6
PERCENT				78.7%	6.6%	12.1%	1.3%	0.9%	4.2%	70.5%	11.4%	7.8%	6.0%	61.8%	15.2%	83.0%	3.6%

Appendix VII

SCHOOL NAME	TYPE SCHOOL	PRIN ATTNDS MEETINGS			PRIN SUBMIT PROPOSAL			LSIC EVER DISAPPRV			ENG OR LUNCH ATTENDS			NEEDS ASSESS		SCH IMP PLAN		PHES TRAINED		LSIC BYLAWS	
		A	S	N	A	S	N	A	S	N	A	S	N	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
DuBois	elem	X				X				X	X				X		X		X		X
Grissom	elem		X				X			X			X		X		X		X	X	
Owens	elem	X			X					X			X		X		X	X		X	
Pullman	elem	X			X					X	X			X		X		X		X	
Sowalon	elem	X				X				X			X		X		X	X		X	
Van Vlissenger	elem	X					X			X	X			X			X	X		X	
Washington	elem	X					X			X		X			X		X	X		X	
Lake View	h.s.	X			X					X		X		X		X		X			X
Lincoln Park	h.s.	X					X			X	X				X		X		X	X	
Mather	h.s.	X				X				X	X				X		X	X		X	
Taft	h.s.	X				X				X	X				X		X		X	X	
Wilson	h.s.			X			X			X			X		X		X	X			X
Farragut	h.s.	X					X			X		X			X	X			X		X
Juarez	h.s.	X			X					X	X			X		X		X		X	
Kelly	h.s.	X					X			X	X			X		X		X			X
Young	h.s.	X			X					X	X			X			X	X			X
Carver	h.s.		X			X				X	X				X		X	X		X	
Chicago Voc	h.s.	X			X					X	X			X		X		X		X	
Harlan	h.s.		X			X				X			X		X		X	X		X	
King	h.s.			X			X			X			X	X			X		X			X
Morgan Park	h.s.	X				X				X				X		X		X		X	
South Shore	h.s.	X			X					X	X			X			X	X		X	
TOTAL		131	29	4	79	37	47	0	5	159	107	11	47	85	78	69	94	113	50	131	32
PERCENT		79.9%	17.7%	2.4%	48.5%	22.7%	28.8%	0.0%	3.0%	97.0%	64.8%	6.7%	28.5%	52.1%	47.9%	42.3%	57.7%	69.3%	30.7%	80.4%	19.6%